

Aide-de-Camp's Library



सत्यमेव जयते


Rashtrapati Bhavan
New Delhi

Accn. No. 335

Call No. II (a) - S
III (b) - S

.

TO THE RECIPIENT OF THIS BOOK

ECAUSE we believe this is a timely and constructive little volume, a group of friends of the author conceived the idea of sending it to you with their compliments, as well as to a select group of other public-spirited and influential persons. It approaches the problems of the present Global War and its aftermath from a somewhat “different” angle. We hope you will find it interesting.

PREScription FOR PERMANENT PEACE

By

WILLIAM S. SADLER, M.D., F.A.P.A.

Consulting Psychiatrist, Columbus Hospital
Author, *Theory and Practice of Psychiatry*,
The Mind at Mischief, *Living a Sane Sex Life*,
Growing Out of Babyhood, etc.



WILCOX AND FOLLETT CO.

CHICAGO

1944

COPYRIGHT, 1944, by
WILCOX AND FOLLETT CO. .
Printed in the U.S.A.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
1. Why World Wars	1
2. Paranoid Trends	10
3. Paranoid Germany	22
4. Schizoid Trends—Isolationism.....	44
5. Lessons of the War.....	59
6. Foundations of Peace	82
7. Mankind Government	107
8. World Citizenship	134
9. Destiny Drafts Uncle Sam.....	156
10. The Challenge of Permanent Peace...	187

FOREWORD

IT IS not strange that a physician who has practiced his profession for almost forty years, whose life has been devoted to searching for the causes of human ailments and to seeking to effect their cure, should come to look upon certain world problems and dilemmas, such as war, as chronic diseases. Thus conceiving war to be a disease, it is natural that the physician—more especially the psychiatrist—should attempt to formulate a prescription for peace, attempt to identify and propose those conditions which might justify the hope for *permanent peace*.

Since we conceive of health as the normal state for the individual man, we may be justified in regarding peace as the normal and healthy state for nations. This little book, then, is the attempt of a psychiatrist to portray his views of the causes of war, more especially of World War I and the present global struggle, and then, following this analysis of the causes, to present a plan, a prescription, designed to effect a cure of this war disease of mankind and ultimately to lead to the enjoyment of lasting peace.

I am not in agreement with those who contend that we should be concerned only with winning the war, that consideration of the peace should be relegated to the future. I sincerely believe that it is our duty to plan for peace and the future world order even while the war is being waged.

In passing, perhaps I should confess to being a disillusioned isolationist, since up to six or eight years ago the refusal of the United States to enter the League of Nations and participate actively in international relations had received my full approval; but even before Hitler marched into Poland, my eyes had been opened to the necessity for America's more active participation in world affairs.

This book attempts a diagnostic study of Germany and the other Axis powers, goes on to examine our traditional American attitudes respecting isolationism and internationalism, and then systematically points out the psychologic, sociologic, economic, and political problems attendant upon the attempt to arrive at a permanent peace through the establishment of an effective government of mankind.

In writing a book of this sort one naturally gives expression to many ideas which have been absorbed from many sources. I have not been able to read such books as Brickner's *Is Germany Incurable*, MacIver's *Towards an Abiding Peace*, Lippmann's *United States Foreign Policy*, and Reves' *A Democratic Manifesto*, without being so favorably impressed that the ideas of these various writers find more or less expression in these pages.

I regret that it is not possible for me to acknowledge the source of the many concepts presented here which I have gleaned from scores of authors, for not all of the ideas and sentiments herein contained were original with me. Far from it. These

chapters embody my attempt during the past decade—more especially since Hitler invaded Poland—to “pick berries” off every available bush.

My long-time associate, Wilfred C. Kellogg, contributed many valuable suggestions in the preparation of this manuscript, and Linton J. Keith supplied many suggestions and contributed very materially to the final preparation of the manuscript for publication. His contributions have been very valuable, since they far exceed mere editorial suggestions.

W. S. S.

533 Diversey Parkway, Chicago

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the permission given by the following authors and publishers to quote from their books.

Brickner, Dr. R. M., *Is Germany Incurable*, J. B. Lippincott; Carr, E. H., *Conditions of Peace*, The Macmillan Company; Corbett, P. E., *Post-War Worlds*, Farrar & Rinehart; Hoover, H., and Gibson, H., *Problems of Lasting Peace*, Doubleday, Doran & Company; Lin Yutang, *Between Tears and Laughter*, John Day Company; Myrdal, G., *An American Dilemma*, Harper & Brothers; Reves, E., *A Democratic Manifesto*, Random House, Inc.; Romulo, C. P., *Mother America*, Doubleday, Doran & Company, Inc.; Spykman, N. J., *America's Strategy in World Politics*, Harcourt, Brace & Company; Vansittart, Baron R. G., *Lessons of My Life*, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

CHAPTER 1

WHY WORLD WARS?

FOR the second time in a single generation the world is at war. Is this to be our tragic lot world without end? The answer quite certainly is *Yes*—unless by some extraordinary exercise of reason and self-control man can succeed in finally eliminating the conditions that make wars inevitable.

For the second time in a generation the opportunity is ours of building a world in which peace rather than war may become the prevailing order. Are we today any better prepared than in 1918 to grasp this opportunity and turn it to lasting peace? The answer must surely be *No*—unless the world is now ready to learn from its past mistakes how wars can be avoided in the future. Are we now willing to recognize how we lost the peace even after we had won the first world war?

Why did we fail to achieve a lasting peace after World War I? What mistakes were the cause of this second global war? When the people of the United States and the other United Nations can agree on the correct answer to these two questions, a lasting peace will become a genuine possibility—but not before.

From many years' experience in the practice of medicine, I have learned that accurate identification

of the true source and nature of an infection is the necessary first step in working out a permanent cure. If this important truth could be generally recognized and put to use by all concerned with finding a cure for war, the prospects of a successful outcome would be greatly improved. To help bring about such a recognition and to promote a sound understanding of some of the causes of war will be our endeavor throughout the early chapters of this book. The later chapters will offer a "prescription for peace."

WAR AN INFECTIOUS DISEASE

To treat of war and peace in this manner is no idle analogy. War really does have the diagnostic characteristics of an infectious disease, including (1) a preliminary stage of *incubation*, during which the latent germs of greed, suspicion, hatred, and fear proliferate at an ever-increasing rate and pour their deadly toxins into the bloodstream of world society; (2) a stage of *crisis*, during which the anti-toxins and antibodies of health lock themselves in feverish combat with the now-rampant forces of destruction; and (3) a stage of *convalescence*, during which the world-body gradually returns to its normal condition. War further reveals its pathological nature in its lingering aftereffects and its chronic tendency to recur with ever greater severity. And with war as with sickness, "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

To discover and understand the causes of war is therefore the scientific way to begin the search for its prevention and cure. Only by a systematic effort to get at and uproot all of war's causes can peace be effectively maintained. And to say that is to suggest the immensity of our undertaking. For the causes of war are legion, and every passing conflict leaves fresh provocations in its wake. World War II will be no exception. Our task then is twofold: (1) to ascertain the causes of one war and (2) to anticipate—in order to forestall—the causes of another. Difficult though this be, we dare not undertake anything less. The penalty we shall have to pay for any shirking of present duties will be another and still greater world war to come.

FAILURE OF PACIFISM

One of the first things we must learn is that wars cannot be prevented by blind concentration upon the comforts of peace. If they could be, then there would have been no World War II. For the one thing that stood out above all others as the characteristic feature of the armistice years (1919-1939) was the unprecedented and uninhibited passion for "peace at any price." These were the years during which the victorious powers voluntarily scrapped most of the armed strength by which their victory had been won. So earnestly did they desire to avoid war that they fell into the fatal error of thinking

that lasting peace could be had for the mere wishing. They solemnly subscribed to the Kellogg-Briand Pact, whose only real effect was to confirm the peace-loving peoples of the world more blindly than ever in their wishful thinking.

Faced in the 1930's with the growing might of armed aggression, the leaders of the democracies still refused to believe that anything could happen to break the magic spell of peace. Their fondest desire found its perfect expression in the phrase "peace in our time." Their blindness to realities was finally demonstrated at Munich. Their dream of peace ended in the horrible nightmare of a war for which they had foolishly done nothing to prepare.

No. Wars are not to be prevented by a too-anxious devotion to peace. On the contrary, as the past twenty-five years have proved, such blind infatuation on the part of the peace-loving nations constitutes a standing invitation to acts of aggression on the part of nations for whom peace is a concern of lesser importance. The first—and perhaps the hardest—lesson to be learned from our past mistakes then is that our own pacific intentions afford no guarantee of a lasting peace. We shall have to convert our noble intentions into realistic lines of action.

PROVOCATIONS OF WAR

One serious weakness of our overemphasizing the virtues of peace is that doing so does not keep peace-

loving nations from pursuing contrary lines of action which ultimately lead to war. This was amply demonstrated after the first world war when all the democracies, despite their frequent protestations of peace, resorted each in its own way to policies which proved to be anything but pacific in their combined effects. The United States contributed to the outcome by its high tariffs, discriminatory immigration laws, and narrow isolationism. The other democracies contributed in various ways, including burdensome trade restrictions and failure to co-operate effectively to curb aggression. None assumed any responsibility for safeguarding world peace.

But although the democracies did each contribute in its own way to the conditions which made the present war possible, nevertheless, even these mistaken policies were not the true cause of the conflict. Blind and selfish the democracies were, to be sure, but they did most sincerely desire peace, and their worst mistakes sprang from their too-innocent hope of avoiding war.

Yes, the democracies hated war. They longed for peace, and they consistently pursued appeasement from the days when the Japs invaded Manchuria on through to the Darlan episode in North Africa. But any account of the coming of the war that imputes a major share of blame to them falls far short of being a sound diagnosis. Nothing they did or failed to do adds up to a sufficient cause for war.

They created no situations that could not have been amicably adjusted if the other nations had reciprocated their preference for peace. War came because the will to peace was utterly lacking among the Axis nations. The democracies could have avoided war only by continuing to appease the aggressors. It is to their everlasting credit that they saw the folly of appeasement while there was yet time to save themselves and the world from a disaster more terrible than war.

Undoubtedly the Axis nations would have preferred peace, too, if they had always been able to get what they wanted without having to fight for it. But when their continued aggressions finally encountered a show of resistance, as in Poland, they did not hesitate to start a war. Never did a nation resort more brazenly to war and the threat of war as an instrument of foreign policy than did the Axis powers from 1935 on. They not only engaged in wars, they preached war and violence as national virtues.

WAR AS NATIONAL POLICY

What chance have the peace-loving nations of the world to abolish war as long as other powerful nations glorify it and make it an essential part of their foreign policies? It is all very well to point out shortcomings in our own policies. But that is only part of the job that must be done before war can be finally abolished. The other part is curing the war-

like propensities that have twice in a generation led Germany to engage in aggressive war.

It is no longer possible to account for Germany's warlike propensities in the usual way as the normal conduct of a "have-not" nation deprived of its colonies, made the victim of an unjust peace, and compelled by the pressure of its growing population to expand its national boundaries. Such explanations try to explain too much, for if they are the grounds of Germany's belligerency, like conditions should produce like results in other regions of the globe. They have not done so.

The true explanation of German aggression lies deeper. It is to be found neither in history nor in economics but in the province of abnormal psychology. The fact is that Germany's national policies for the last century and a half exhibit pronounced symptoms of *paranoia*. This being the case, it is the height of folly to treat the patient for any sort of illness other than the one he has.

As a medical man I know the danger of an incomplete diagnosis—one based only upon the more easily recognized symptoms. If we are to get at the true seat of the trouble—as we surely must if we are to effect a cure—then we shall have to look beyond the superficial symptoms ordinarily presented. We shall have to look for the cause deep inside the German nation itself. We must recognize the German proclivity for violence, persecution, and war

as a disease and search for its cause within the person of the German people.

Attention has been frequently called to the resemblance of German military aggression to the behavior of paranoid individuals. Accumulating evidence leads to the conclusion that this resemblance is more than apparent. It is real. And the next two chapters will outline the evidence for the diagnosis that Germany—and to only less degree Italy and Japan—has been the victim of national paranoia.

It was our failure to recognize the true nature of Germany's condition that allowed us to err in our handling of the situation between wars. The policy of appeasement which we followed was precisely the wrong one to adopt toward a nation of Germany's paranoid trend.

SUMMARY

In the first world struggle we won the war and lost the peace. In the present conflict we must win the peace as well as the war.

War is a deadly disease of nations; it incubates and spreads like a ravishing infection. It can be mastered only by searching out its causes and applying effective preventive and curative measures.

Pacifism betrayed us; wishful thinking failed to bring "peace in our time." Peace pacts do not prevent wars; our dream of peace was a delusion.

Our idealistic love of peace only invited barbarous

aggression. Our noble peace sentiments must be converted into realistic and effective action.

It is possible to provoke war while earnestly longing for peace. But notwithstanding the mistakes of the democracies, nothing could have prevented war while the war-mad Axis aggressors stalked over the earth.

There can be no permanent peace so long as powerful aggressor nations preach violence as a virtue and proclaim war as a national policy.

The first victory in the battle for peace will be won when we get to the bottom of the reason behind such antisocial credos. We find it in the fact that German aggression is rooted in abnormal psychology—the increasing egotism and ruthless cruelty of the Teutonic paranoid character.

We must not be deceived by the superficial symptoms of German violence and cruelty; the true cause lies deep in the Germanic paranoid attitude of suspicion and delusions of persecution.

•

CHAPTER 2

PARANOID TRENDS

THE term *paranoia* is used by psychiatrists to designate a wide variety of mental disorders ranging all the way from mild paranoid tendencies up to true paranoia. Many of these abnormal mental states are more accurately described as *paranoid trends*. The distinguishing characteristic common to the various types of paranoia is the presence of systematic delusions concerning the subject's own importance. He readily comes to believe himself the center of everything happening around him.

True paranoiacs are frequently dangerous if left at large, and paranoia in all its forms is a potential source of danger both to the subject and to his associates. Although true paranoia is somewhat rare, the existence of paranoid trends in otherwise apparently normal individuals is frequently observed. Most such cases never go beyond the stage of harmless "cranks," but a certain percentage develop by degrees into more serious forms of paranoia. One of the valuable services which psychiatry has to render is to educate the public to recognize the existence of paranoid trends while there is yet time to correct them.

Paranoid trends can sometimes be detected even

in the nursery, but they ordinarily first appear in late adolescence or early adulthood. Although no two cases show exactly the same symptoms, certain characteristics are more or less common to all. In the analysis to follow we include only those which are relevant to the purpose for which this chapter is written—namely, to provide the basis for a subsequent diagnosis of paranoid trends in a nation. To describe all the symptoms would take us off the main path to our destination.

PARANOID CHARACTERISTICS

Suspicion. The paranoid characteristic first to assert itself is suspicion. Parents and teachers are often alarmed at the appearance in young children of such traits as lying and stealing. To the psychiatrist, however, shyness and suspicion are more serious causes for alarm. Extreme shyness is frequently a first symptom of the schizoid type of personality, and extreme suspicion of the paranoid trend. Hence the presence of either of these traits in children may well merit the attention of the psychiatrist. Suspicion does not always indicate a paranoid trend, it is true, but paranoid trends always include suspicion as an outstanding characteristic.

One aspect of this trait takes the form of extreme *sensitiveness*. Of course, many people are sensitive, but paranoids are sensitive in a way all their own. They tend to *project* their feelings and anxieties out

upon their surroundings and especially upon other people. It is with reference to slights and insults thus projected out of their own imaginations that they are peculiarly sensitive. Their suspicions feed upon these imagined wrongs.

As the paranoid grows up through adolescence into early adulthood, he becomes increasingly ingenious in *misinterpreting* the ordinary events of life. Commonplace things happen to him just as they do to his friends and neighbors, but they come to have a different and peculiar meaning to him. On some social occasion, if a paranoid sees two people talking in a low tone, he is quite likely to conclude they are talking about him, and that they are saying critical and unfavorable things. It seldom occurs to him that they may be saying favorable things about him. This perverted trend of misinterpretation increasingly causes him to feel that his neighbors and associates are unfriendly and hypercritical, or even hostile. He is constantly worrying about what others think of him, and after years of this worry and anxiety he later develops a peculiar and characteristic form of disdainful and contemptuous bravado.

Psychiatrists use the term *self-reference* to characterize individuals who tend to apply to themselves in a purely personal way everything that occurs in their environment. To the paranoid the universe is always unfriendly. Life swarms with conspirators who are his confirmed enemies, and who are devoted

to making life miserable and unbearable for him.

Egotism. Another characteristic of the paranoid trend that usually asserts itself at an early age is the habit of thinking and talking overly much about oneself. The typical paranoid is inordinately conceited and persistently egotistic. Often this is only a compensatory reaction to an inferiority complex. Deep down in his heart such an individual, at least during the earlier stages of his disorder, is usually haunted by feelings of inadequacy. To hide these feelings from himself he covers them over with an exaggerated show of self-importance. He becomes stubborn and proud. In time he grows disdainful of the opinions and rights of others.

At the same time his inflated ego craves attention and recognition. The longing to be highly regarded by his fellows often becomes pathological in its intensity. Under the name of *status anxiety*, this is a trait well known to the psychologist.

Envy and Jealousy. Paranoids are usually envious of the success and the prosperity of their neighbors. They regard the possessions of others with jealous eyes and habitually scheme and connive to obtain some equivalent advantage. Failing that, they resort to belittling the achievements of others and to glorifying their own superior virtues.

Desire to Dominate. Most paranoids become very ambitious. They crave to live on a level above their fellows. They demand special privileges and hold

themselves above the rules and restraints of society. In whatever group they find themselves, they are domineering and imperious. They recognize no one as their superior and are not content until they imagine themselves in authority over others. Some paranoids possess considerable ability as leaders, but whether they have the ability or not, they all seek to lead. Some of them try their hands at invention, others at remaking the world. As time goes on, the paranoid grows increasingly aggressive.

Irrationality. Paranoids do not reason out situations the way normal persons do. They tend to "short-circuit" their logic and to jump to conclusions by imagining things to be as they want them to be. Frequently they can argue so plausibly as to convince their associates as well as themselves. Preconceived ideas play a very large part in their reasoning processes. They become very clever at alibis and in shifting responsibility for their own mistakes. The other fellow is always to blame when something goes wrong. These traits are all part of a deep-rooted tendency to treat the world as a mirror in which they can see only their own image.

Not only do such persons misinterpret present realities; they habitually falsify past happenings as well. They remember the past not as it actually was; but as their subconscious minds would have liked it to be. Their memories are very inventive, and always in a way flattering to their own sense of importance.

This *retroactive falsification* is a peculiar and diagnostic characteristic of the paranoid personality.

Persecution Complex. Sooner or later every paranoid comes to the firm conviction that he has not had an even break in life, that he has been denied a square deal. Victims of this disorder are always seeking justice. Many of them appear repeatedly in courts, suing individuals or corporations for imaginary injuries of one sort or another. Usually they develop the *fixed idea* that they are being persecuted by some group of people, such as the Jews, the Masons, or the Catholics. They imagine all kinds of reasons why their persecutors should "have it in for them," and it is utterly impossible for anyone to talk them out of their complex.

For one thing, paranoids do not have a normal sense of humor to which one can appeal. They are in dead earnest about everything they believe and do. And no amount of kindness or compromise will appease them. A paranoid is simply unappeasable. Any attempt at appeasement is bound to be rewarded with further demands. Their thirst for what they egotistically consider "justice" is insatiable.

In its fully developed condition their abnormal state of mind becomes a *martyr complex*. The victims of such a complex readily accept the role of martyr and fairly revel in the halo of importance which it sheds upon them. Their minds dwell upon the martyrs of old who suffered persecution, and they fondly

imagine themselves worthy members of that distinguished company.

Megalomania. As the years pass, this tendency of the paranoid to magnify his own importance becomes more and more pronounced. There slowly grows up in his mind a belief that he is singled out by destiny to perform great deeds. He imagines himself called upon to right some cosmic wrong, to accomplish some tremendous reform, or to inaugurate a new world order. If given the opportunity, a paranoid individual now and then may go some way toward the achievement of his grandiose aims. Most such individuals however find their place in the so-called "lunatic fringe" that inevitably gathers about every social movement.

It is characteristic of this trend that the individual never experiences any feeling of guilt for the mistakes and crimes which he may commit under the compulsion of his idea of destiny. In his own thoughts he stands above right and wrong, a law unto himself. Whatever he chooses to do is right for him, and woe unto the person or thing that gets in the way. Moreover, the paranoid is never *deterred by defeat*. He is as incapable of recognizing defeat as he is of admitting error or guilt. He will make the same attempt over and over again with only a change of tactics. His idea of destiny is "fixed" beyond possibility of change.

Delusions. By the time the paranoid becomes fixed in his idea of destiny, he is already on the verge of true paranoia. That final stage is reached with the onset of *delusions*. By then he is definitely *psychotic*—or insane. Up to this stage paranoids do not harm people. They are not homicidal. They may start lawsuits, build spite fences, write harassing letters to ministers, public officials, and political leaders, but not until *delusions* appear are they dangerous to society.

When these delusions appear, when they begin to *hear voices*, they will presently start to systematize both voices and delusions. Shortly they will go forth to carry out that which the voices have told them to do. They very cleverly systematize their delusions, and they can do it so expertly that many times their friends believe in them. They sometimes convince the courts they are right, and they are even able sometimes to impose upon physicians who have not given much thought and study to paranoia.

At first the paranoid's delusions are likely to be those of persecution. Someone is conspiring to make trouble for him. Some group is "out to get" him. But as time passes, he reasons that to be the object of so much attention he must be a person of great importance, and he forthwith begins to indulge in *delusions of grandeur*. He soon imagines himself to be a Napoleon Bonaparte, the Messiah, or some other famous personage of history.

When the stage of true paranoia has been reached, the individual is a menace to society and fit only for confinement. Under the delusion that he is *hearing voices*, he is perfectly capable of plotting and executing the most fiendish crimes imaginable. If the "voices" order him to assassinate some prominent personage, he will, unless restrained, obtain a gun and endeavor to obey the command. Too frequently such individuals are taken into custody only after they have committed a serious crime. They should be apprehended at the first appearance of dangerous delusions and confined in a hospital for the insane.

The foregoing discussion of paranoid trends fits a typical case, but many such individuals do not live long enough to develop the dangerous behavior of the final stages of the disorder. It will perhaps have occurred to the reader that many of the distinguishing traits of the paranoid personality are in some measure characteristic of the human species as a whole. This is quite true. It is not the fact that a person is suspicious, conceited, or envious that brands him as a paranoid. Rather it is the presence of these traits in excess and in peculiar association that constitutes a paranoid personality. The early symptoms of paranoia are not easily diagnosed. And many cases of paranoid trends never develop into a real paranoia. Most such persons, though generally recognized as queer and obnoxious by their associates, live out their days in relative peace.

TREATMENT

Whether or not a paranoid can be helped depends upon the existence and extent of a *clear area* within his personality. The majority of paranoid individuals have many experiences not essentially different from those of normal persons. With sufficient patience and understanding the skillful psychiatrist can very often successfully expand this clear area to the gradual exclusion of abnormal experiences peculiar to paranoia. This is the only way the trend can be arrested and brought under control, and the chances of success are proportionate to the area remaining clear of paranoiac abnormalities.

When the paranoid once begins to hear voices, it is usually too late to do anything for him. His clear area is too far reduced for effective treatment. But until that stage is reached there exists the possibility that the patient may be helped. Much can be accomplished if he is still normal enough most of the time to realize the paranoid character of his abnormal moments.

One very important first step in treating this ailment consists in getting it recognized for what it is by the family and near associates of the patient. The members of a paranoid's family or intimate circle can do much to aggravate the condition if they are not instructed in the proper way of dealing with him. Usually they either humor or resent him. Neither method ever proves effective. The paranoid does

not respond to kindness or criticism as normal persons do. He must be treated in a manner appropriate to his abnormal condition. This means resisting his paranoid aggressions patiently but nevertheless firmly. Above all, he must not be permitted to think that his associates are being taken in by his stratagems and delusions.

SUMMARY

Paranoia is a mental disorder whose victims range all the way from harmless "cranks" up to dangerous psychopaths.

Suspicion is the outstanding symptom of paranoids. They are peculiarly sensitive and tend to project their fears out upon other people.

Their ingenious misinterpretations of what goes on around them creates the belief that they are victims of numerous slights and insults.

They are victims of "self-reference"—the unwarranted practice of applying wholly irrelevant happenings to themselves.

The paranoid is inordinately conceited—persistently egotistic. Though often disdainful of public opinion, he still craves recognition.

Paranoids are envious and jealous of the achievements of others; they belittle them in order to glorify themselves.

They are domineering and imperious. They are ambitious and aggressive, and crave authority.

Paranoids do not think and reason like normal

persons—they “short-circuit” logic and formulate conclusions to suit their own projects.

They even falsify history—they recall the past so as to justify their present attitudes and flatter their feelings of self-importance. They are expert at inventing alibis.

Paranoids have a persecution complex—they are always seeking “justice.” Many even develop a martyr complex. They lack a sense of humor and are utterly unappeasable.

The paranoid becomes obsessed with the conviction of “destiny.” He drives on oblivious to right or wrong and becomes a law unto himself.

He is a stranger to all feelings of guilt, and he is never conscious of defeat. He relentlessly pursues his goal.

Sooner or later delusions appear. Paranoids eventually begin to hear “voices.” At first these delusions are persecutory, but presently they become grandiose. The paranoid imagines himself to be some great personage.

The hearing of voices means that the paranoid has become a menace to society. This is the psychotic, or insane, stage and calls for confinement.

Paranoids can be helped if there is a sufficient “clear area” to enable them to recognize their own paranoid tendencies, and if they are co-operative. It is highly important that their associates also recognize the disorder.

CHAPTER 3

PARANOID GERMANY

THE symptoms of paranoia are well enough known today to be readily recognizable when they occur in individuals. But the condition is not limited to individuals. The same paranoid characteristics are sometimes exhibited by groups and, when fully established, warrant the same diagnosis. Correct diagnosis is even more important in a case of *group paranoia*, because the behavior of groups has greater social effects than the behavior of individuals. Paranoid groups, as we now are beginning to realize, can endanger not only the safety of their immediate neighbors but also the continued existence of civilization itself.

Though the concept is of recent origin, group paranoia is not a new or unusual condition. The "abnormality" of mobs has been known for many years to students of psychology, and history supplies numerous examples of groups and even of nations whose behavior over considerable periods of time has exhibited growing trends of a paranoid nature. The Ku Klux Klan was one such example in the history of our own country. Other more recent examples include the German American Bund, the Coughlinites, and the various "Front" organizations which

employed, and in some instances still employ, high-sounding labels reeking with sham patriotism and mock piety to conceal their real purpose of gaining dictatorial power over the policies and destinies of our nation. But the clearest cases of group paranoia, in modern times at least, are the Axis countries, Germany and Japan. In the behavior of these two nations we see as through a magnifying glass all the major identifying characteristics of paranoia.

Case histories of individual paranoids usually reveal a slow, almost imperceptible, spreading of the disease over wider and wider areas of the patient's personality. Though the causes of this spreading out are not clearly understood, it seems to be the cumulative product of the individual's external experience interacting with certain abnormal elements of his original neuropsychic make-up.

In the case of groups, the paranoid condition seems to originate with, and radiate from, influential individuals who are either paranoid themselves or a source of paranoid attitudes and ideas of a highly "infectious" nature. Although any group of people is apt to include a few such persons, certain groups are more susceptible than others to paranoid influences, the reasons lying in their composition and collective experiences. As in individual paranoia, the treatment consists in expanding the "clear area," which means building up the group's resistance to infection by paranoid attitudes and ideas.

The time has come for the "doctors" of our body politic to recognize that nations as well as individuals can become paranoid. National paranoia exists when a nation behaves toward other nations the way paranoid individuals behave toward other individuals. For a nation to behave in a paranoid way it is not necessary that all the citizens, or even a preponderance of them, be paranoids. All that is necessary is that a majority of citizens be willing to support national policies that are paranoid. Such a nation may at first have no greater percentage of paranoid individuals than nonparanoid nations, but the willingness of its people to follow paranoid leadership is almost certain to produce a higher percentage as the years go by—unless something happens to alter the tendency.

Nations that are naturally egotistic, aggressive, and domineering succumb more readily than others to the intoxicating influence of paranoid thinking. Such an environment naturally follows the rise of paranoid individuals to positions of political and military leadership. This in turn reacts upon the whole national culture to bend it still further away from nonparanoid paths of development. Thus national paranoia engenders a vicious circle from which there can be but one avenue of escape. The circle must be broken by external force such as is now being applied by the United Nations to paranoid Germany and Japan.

CHARACTERISTICS OF GERMAN PARANOIA

National paranoia betrays itself in the same characteristics as individual paranoia. When we find in a nation the identical pattern of abnormal behavior that characterizes individual paranoids, we are justified in treating it as a paranoid nation. We are not only justified, we are obliged in our own self-defense so to treat it. To treat such a nation otherwise is to encourage it to become still more paranoid in its behavior.

As a psychiatrist I cannot contemplate the last 150 years of Germany's history without being impressed by the unmistakable evidence of growing paranoid trends in its conduct toward other nations and races. Similar trends are observable in the last 100 years of Japanese history, though much complicated by racial and cultural differences. For generation after generation these two nations have consciously cultivated paranoid values and patterned their behavior more and more on paranoid lines.

No mere accident of history brings these two countries together as allies. Following parallel "paths to glory" as they have been doing for many decades, they were bound sooner or later in a shrinking world to make common cause against the nonparanoid nations.

Centering our attention upon Germany, we readily recognize all the paranoid characteristics identified in Chapter 2.

Suspicion. This characteristic has been one of the cornerstones of recent German policy. Upon it the Nazis have based their most effective propaganda. Hitler and his gangsters rose to power in Germany by whipping up fears and distrust among their own countrymen. Jews, communists, and democrats were repeatedly pilloried as objects of suspicion. Later, the Nazis whetted the nation's appetite for war with trumped-up fears of their neighbors—Russia, France, Great Britain, and even little Czechoslovakia and Poland. They thundered so loudly and long about the dangers of “encirclement” and “Bolshevism” that they convinced even themselves.

So successful was their appeal to suspicion at home that they felt encouraged to use the same tactics with neighboring nations. By fanning the flames of mutual suspicion, the Nazis succeeded at Munich in dividing the western democracies from their natural allies, the Russians. After the outbreak of war they continued with decreasing success to foment distrust among their enemies. In this nefarious enterprise they largely failed, in spite of much assistance given them by disloyal malcontents in our own country and Great Britain. Suspicion proved to be one of the characteristics not generally shared by the democracies. Nevertheless, the Nazis continued to project their own suspicions upon other people and to assume that these other people were moved by the same irrational fears as they themselves.

This German trait also takes the form of *self-reference*. Again and again the German people have shown remarkable ingenuity in misinterpreting events in ways that lent seeming justification to their own evil designs. Thus they held themselves blameless for all the steps leading up to the war, including the annexation of Austria; the partition and seizure of Czechoslovakia; the attacks on Poland, Denmark, Norway, Belgium, and the Netherlands; and the invasion of Russia. To the Germans' usual way of thinking, all the world is leagued in perpetual conspiracy against them.

The key principle of Nazi aggression appears to be: Put everything into the initial effort. Strike down your enemies and loot them. Strike them down one by one and rob them. As long as Hitler could go on doing this, the Nazis kept going—National Socialism thrived and waxed strong. But when there were no more nations to be looted, no more subject peoples to be exploited, the going began to get tough, and Himmler was called in to keep the German people in line.

Hitler has gone about this business cold-bloodedly. The Nazis have figured out that each country can be robbed of approximately what it formerly spent on its annual budget—its appropriation for both civil and military expenditures. This sum the Nazis assess as the cost of the armies of occupation. This is a form of reparations based on "capacity to pay

—and to pay at the point of a bayonet, with the victorious enemy forces on hand to collect.” This is a scheme of levying tribute which puts to shame the old technique of trying to collect after the war was over and the victors had gone home.

Egotism. A second paranoid characteristic of the German people is their inordinate conceit. Probably no other nation in history has had so high an opinion of its own superlative importance. “We are a conceited people,” said Bismarck. “We become irritable if we cannot be boasting, and we think highly of a government that makes us look important to the outside world.”

This attitude of boastfulness is unquestionably related to their late arrival on the stage of civilization and world politics. The Germans remained semi-barbaric and disunited for centuries after the peoples of western Europe had achieved an advanced state of culture and of national unity. Thus throughout much of their past the German people have been plagued by feelings of inadequacy, and as in the case of many individuals afflicted with inferiority complexes, their rampant egotism is partly compensatory.

This paranoid trend has culminated in the infamous dogma of racial superiority. For more than a hundred years the Germans have been persuading themselves that they are a “chosen race” whose mission it is to rule the world. Their teachers and politicians have labored incessantly to convince the

people that they represent the highest moral and intellectual values of humanity, that they are the flower of European civilization. "The good God," said Kaiser Wilhelm, "would not have given himself so much trouble over our German country if he had not reserved a great destiny for us. We are the salt of the earth. . . . God has made us for the civilizing of the world." In the Kaiser's day it was German *Kultur* that was to civilize the world. Under the Nazis only people of *Aryan blood* can hope to share in civilization. Thus has the German trend into paranoia grown from generation to generation.

Nevertheless, in spite of their boastful assertions of superiority and their disparagement of everything non-German, they crave the admiration of the whole world. This German trait has been well described by Lord Vansittart (*Lessons of My Life*, pp. 94-95) as "the passion for notice, for attention from others." "Nothing has irritated the Germans . . . more," he writes, "than lack of the notice due to their exaggerated pretensions." The explanation with which they soothe their injured pride when they feel themselves insufficiently appreciated is that they are not "understood." This, according to Dr. Richard M. Brickner (*Is Germany Incurable*, p. 170), is another of the German paranoid symptoms. "Failure to understand him is one of the most frequent reproaches with which the individual paranoid harasses his family and friends." The Nazis exploited the *status anxiety*

of the German people for all it was worth in their rise to power.

Envy and Jealousy. Another trait of the German character that the Nazis knew how to exploit was their century-old discontent with their portion of the earth's surface and with the natural resources which fate had allotted to them. Their demand for *Lebensraum* has grown louder and fiercer with the years. With increasing envy they eyed their neighbors' possessions and worked themselves into more and more of a lather of indignation over the imagined injustice of their position.

In themselves, envy and jealousy do not always indicate paranoia. In the ordinary manifestations they are quite normal characteristics of quite normal people. But in the extreme forms which they take in the German national character they are unmistakably paranoid in trend. For they have become fixed obsessions of such intensity that the German people can no longer be trusted to keep their hands off their neighbors. As our former ambassador to Berlin, William Dodd, has said: "These Germans, even those who are considered liberal, seem never to think about the rights of smaller nations. . . . No German ever seems to think seizure of other people's territory is wrong."

Desire to Dominate. One of the German characteristics that has survived all the political changes of the past hundred years is the will to power. In the

judgment of Wallace R. Deuel, this urge to empire has been the most dynamic element in European politics since the downfall of Napoleon. The Germans have made no secret of their ambitions. Before the whole world they call themselves *Herrenvolk*—master, or ruling race. They firmly believe themselves not only qualified but entitled to lord it over the other peoples of the earth. *Deutschland über alles* is the motto which exactly describes their national ambition.

That the German people possess considerable ability as leaders is a fact no one will deny. But as rulers they know only one way of gaining obedience—the way of brute force. They have almost no qualifications for self-government, either as governors or as governed. Some writers, commenting on the lack of democratic elements in German society, have attempted to explain it on the supposition that the country lost most of its liberal minds through emigration to America. This has no doubt been one factor in the situation, but a more significant cause has been the preponderant influence of autocratic ideals of government. The ease with which the Nazis overthrew the Weimar Republic demonstrates the German preference for rule by force—the corollary of their paranoid desire to domineer over other peoples by the same means.

Irrationality. To find proof of the irrationality of the German mind one has only to read a few pages

of *Mein Kampf* or listen to a Nazi propaganda broadcast. Even the most uninformed observer cannot have failed to notice how Germany's leaders and spokesmen all tend to "short-circuit" their logic and jump to conclusions not warranted by a rational interpretation of the facts. Without the blinking of an eye they can justify their own atrocities against Jews and innocent children while condemning the routine bombings of their own cities by the enemy.

Right, say the Nazis, is what serves the German nation. Their own ideas of justice are completely dominated by national self-interest, and yet they grant to no one else the same right to put self-interest first. "One rule for us, another for the rest of the world" accurately states the German point of view.

Their irrationality also shows itself in a nearly complete *lack of humor*. They take everything about themselves very seriously. One of the keenest recollections I have of my student days in Germany is the amusing spectacle of children marching to and from school in stiff ranks. To one accustomed to the natural freedom of American youth such solemn goings-on verged upon the ludicrous. But to the Germans it was all a very serious business. Small wonder that a people so conditioned from infancy on should be lacking in the wholesome ability to laugh at their own pompous nonsense. They have neither the sense of humor nor the spirit of sportsmanship that we Americans regard as normal.

The irrationality of the Germans further appears in their *retroactive falsification* of history. This trait has become in recent years one of the identifying marks of the paranoid German mentality. Under the influence of Nazi propaganda, the Germans have built up a view of history which bears only the vaguest resemblance to actual facts. Although much of this falsification began as deliberate distortion, it ended with implicit acceptance even by the leaders themselves. The German people from Hitler down believe the Nazi lie that Germany was never defeated in World War I, but was betrayed by Jews and liberals. In the same manner they are able to explain away their own responsibility for the present war, shifting the blame to the Poles, to the British, and indeed to everyone but themselves. They are clever at alibis, as are all paranoids.

Persecution Complex. Germany has long suffered from a severe persecution complex. The vulnerability of her central location, the lateness of her origin as a united nation, and her lack of a colonial empire have all combined to produce the conviction in Germany that she has been denied a square deal. Self-pity, as we have seen, is one of the distinguishing characteristics of paranoia. It is also one of the leading traits in the German character. And as kindness and sympathy prove of no avail in dealing with paranoid individuals, so the policy of appeasement and compromise have proved useless in dealing with

paranoid Germany. The more they were appeased the more they demanded.

Individuals suffering from paranoia frequently become so obsessed with their notions of persecution that they strike out viciously at those whom they imagine to be their persecutors. At this point they frequently resort to acts of criminal violence which sooner or later bring down upon them the sort of concerted action which they began by imagining. This, too, has its parallel in German history. Under the notion of persecution Germany has twice entered upon a career of violent aggression which ended by arousing other nations to take concerted action against it.

Megalomania. Coupled with the idea of persecution is the further paranoid idea of destiny. Other nations have prated of "manifest destiny," "white man's burden," etc. But none have acted so fanatically upon the belief in a national destiny as Germany has done in the past hundred years. The words written by the French historian Taine are just as true today as they were nearly three quarters of a century ago. "The Germans," he said, "believe themselves the chosen people, a privileged and superior race . . . called from on high to dominate Europe. That is what they call 'the historic mission of Germany.'" That this does not exaggerate the truth is proved in the following words spoken by Kaiser Wilhelm to the German people: "Remember that you are the

chosen people! The spirit of the Lord has descended upon me because I am Emperor of the Germans! I am the instrument of the Most High. I am His sword, His representative!"

Under the paranoid leadership of Hitler and his Nazi gangsters, Germany has sunk even deeper into megalomania. Its soldiers and civilians alike are thoroughly indoctrinated with the conviction that under their Fuehrer's guidance they are destined to achieve great deeds to save the world from Bolshevism, to inaugurate a new world order. So deeply rooted is this idea of destiny that it remains unshaken in spite of all the defeats Germany has suffered in recent months.

Because of this megalomaniac idea, the Germans regard themselves as above right and wrong—a law unto themselves. They possess no sense of guilt for the numerous atrocities and widespread suffering they have caused. Under the combined notions of persecution and destiny they have plunged the entire world into an inferno of war the like of which has never been seen before. And all without a grain of remorse!

Delusions. The German trend into paranoia has not stopped short of the final stage—*delusions of grandeur*. That they are the "master race" has long been the Germans' chief article of faith. Their delusions reached new levels in the Nazi belief in German invincibility—a belief which grew from victory

to victory until they met their match at Stalingrad and El Alamein.

The evidences of German paranoid trends go back at least as far as Frederick the Great. This great militarist megalomaniac has been for 100 years the favorite hero of the German people. Bismarck, Kaiser Wilhelm II, and Hitler have followed in Frederick's footsteps with only minor additions of their own. The same trends appear in most of the literature and philosophy popular in Germany during the last 150 years. Fichte, Hegel, Nietzsche, Bernhardi, Treitschke, and Houston Chamberlain are among the leaders of thought who have contributed to the evolution of present-day paranoid Germany.

(That much of the foregoing diagnosis applies also to Japan is evidenced by an article in a recent number of *Fuji*, one of Japan's most popular periodicals. The writer, Tsuji Sato, is a member of the Research Institute for National Spiritual Culture. "Since Imperial Japan, with its absolute Emperor and people, is mankind's highest embodiment of truth, wherever it pursues its path there is no power on earth to resist it. On this conviction is based the indestructibility of Japan.")

GERMANY'S CULT OF WAR

The savagery and thoroughness with which the Axis nations have mistreated prisoners and civilians

alike are not to be lightly dismissed as mere incidents of war. They were deliberately planned as part of the campaign to strike terror into the hearts of the Axis enemies. It would be a mistake to hold only the leaders responsible for the atrocities. Whole nations are implicated. The German people have rarely protested against any of the crimes committed by their leaders. Few of the German churches have so much as voiced a word of sympathy for the innocent victims.

These atrocities are the inevitable result of two hundred years of militarism and miseducation. For generations German children have been schooled in hate. Today German youth is unmoved by the knowledge or sight of suffering Poles or Jews. The majority of them are largely without pity. They have been taught ruthlessness toward all people and everything that does not immediately contribute to German success.

Captain Paasche, a nonparanoid German, published a book in 1919 entitled *The Lost Africa*. The Captain did some plain talking in this book. In fact, he told the Germans that they had become an "outlaw nation," that they were a generation of "butchers," and he went on to say that the world would not fellowship the German people until they had become "human." This book had scarcely come off the press when a group of Nazis marched out to the Captain's farm and shot him down in cold blood.

For generations Germany has been giving preference to paranoid standard-bearers, and these individuals have increasingly dominated politics, society, science, and education. These paranoids have rewritten the history taught to German youth, and the whole German culture in peace and in war has been permeated with this type of thinking and reasoning.

Paranoid trends have come to dominate home, church, school, legislature, and even the courts. Everything in German culture has fallen under the blight of this type of leadership. No wonder the mystic medicine man, Hitler, was able to spring up and thrive in such a rich paranoid soil as was represented by prewar Germany.

There has never been any such thing as political equality or social fraternity in Germany. The Germans, like the Japanese, simply do not know anything about the freedom and liberty of the democracies. They have never had a chance to experience them.

In Germany it has been increasingly hard for the nonparanoid Germans, those who are liberty-loving and democratic in convictions, to make any headway. Too many of those who sympathize with them have left Germany for other parts of the world. The real democrats and lovers of liberty are isolated. They are alone. They are a hopeless minority, especially when it comes to making themselves heard or their influence felt. Vansittart estimates that "good Ger-

mans" are outnumbered at least three to one. And many Germans are *sadistic* as well as paranoid. There is still a strain, and many of their philosophers have recognized and admitted it, of *barbarous cruelty* lingering in the German blood. Much of Nazi pageantry represents both a sadistic nature and a paranoid melodramatic trend.

It was probably an uncontrollable paranoid projection that led Hitler treacherously to attack Russia; he was confident she was prepared to attack him. Of course, this paranoid suspicion may, after all, be his undoing. Today it appears that his greatest mistake was his unprovoked assault upon his eastern neighbor.

The world, particularly the British and Americans, thought Hitler was bluffing about invading Poland, but any psychiatrist could have told them he was not bluffing. Get this straight: *Paranoids never bluff*, and this is true of both the individual and the group. True, they may at first cleverly withhold some of their demands. They may be willing to trade, but they always are willing to fight for what they cannot get by peaceful methods.

Hitler said with all apparent sincerity—at least so he impressed Chamberlain—"Sudetenland is all that Germany wants." Then when Chamberlain gave in to him, the crafty dictator presently came back to say, "But that is not enough now. Germany must have more."

The German cult of war has borne its fruits in a people almost wholly devoid of honor, truth, and mercy. They know but one standard of right—the glorification of the German Reich.

CAN GERMANY BE CURED?

The individual paranoid is curable only in proportion to the presence of the “clear area” in his mental make-up. When his delusions are well systematized, he is hopeless. If Germany is paranoid in her present-day trends, is she curable? For some time I have claimed that Germany is curable, that there are enough nonparanoid Germans who are sound psychologically to save Germany, if they can be liberated and placed in charge of her educational and political systems. I have been teaching this for four or five years, and now Dr. Brickner in his book *Is Germany Incurable?* agrees with me that Germany is curable.

But these nonparanoid Germans, these non-Nazis who love liberty and crave freedom, must have strong military protection while they train a new generation of Germans to grow up in the love of liberty and peace. Nothing less than the complete destruction of German militarism and the liquidation of the paranoid ruling clique will put Germany on the road to sane recovery. This must be followed by a program of re-education in which the nonparanoid “clear area” will be given ample opportunity to ex-

pand. Germany can regain her health only as her ingrown nationalism is replaced by loyalty to a larger whole.

SUMMARY

Nations as well as individuals can become paranoid. Germany and Japan now exhibit all of the leading characteristics of paranoia.

Group or national paranoia is a "social infection" which spreads from outstanding paranoids to the susceptible elements in the general population.

National paranoia exists when a nation behaves toward other nations in the way paranoid individuals behave toward other individuals. Nations that are naturally egotistic, aggressive, and domineering, succumb more readily than others to the intoxicating influence of paranoid thinking.

For more than a hundred years Germany and Japan have consciously cultivated paranoid values and patterned their behavior more and more on paranoid lines.

Paranoid suspicion is the outstanding trait of German psychology. The Nazis are inordinately suspicious of the Jews and all other peoples—they trust nobody.

The Germans are so filled with suspicion that they tend to infect other nations. The Germans are victims of self-reference—everything that happens in all the wide world is directed against them. They have an "encirclement" mania.

The Germans are conceited. Their rampant egotism fosters their ridiculous ideas of racial superiority. They believe that they are the "chosen people" destined to rule the world.

And yet underneath all these boastful and vain-glorious pretensions, the Germans suffer from feelings of national inferiority and ardently crave the admiration of other peoples.

The Germans are anxious about their "status," and they are envious and jealous of the prosperity and achievements of other nations. *Lebensraum* is a fixed delusion of the German mind.

The Germans believe in force—they crave to dominate. Brute force is the only method they employ in dominating the conquered peoples. They regard themselves as being the "ruling race."

The Germans are notoriously irrational, being strangers to logic. Right, they say, is what serves the German people. They are devoid of humor—they take everything concerning themselves seriously. They are expert in falsifying history.

True to the paranoid trend, Germany suffers from a persecution complex. And as kindness and sympathy prove useless in dealing with paranoids, so compromise and appeasement proved of no avail in dealing with Germany.

The Germans believe they are destined to dominate the world. This megalomania reached its height in Hitler. Military defeat has not changed Germany.

And the Germans entertain paranoid delusions of grandeur—they have regarded themselves as the master race for more than a hundred years. The Japanese hold the same delusions respecting their racial superiority and national destiny.

The brutality of the German "cult of war" is shown in their ruthless and terrorizing treatment of war prisoners and the subjugated peoples. Leadership in Germany is in the hands of the paranoids. Remember: paranoids do not just bluff—they mean business.

German children have been schooled in hate and brutality. They are utterly lacking in sympathy and pity. Home, church, school, and courts have become paranoid in their philosophy.

But paranoid Germany can be cured if her liberty-loving citizens can be given complete control of German schools and political institutions.

•

CHAPTER 4

SCHIZOID TRENDS—ISOLATIONISM

THE evidence presented in the preceding chapter clearly demonstrates the paranoid character of the German nation and suggests the general line of "treatment" that must be followed if there is to be anything resembling a "cure." But before the victors of the war can settle upon the cure, they might profitably undergo a little psychiatric investigation themselves. Perhaps their own national conduct reveals unhealthy trends which will need correction too. To be specific, what of our own national conduct? Has it been at all times sane and rational?

No one acquainted with our history would call us paranoid. We may have our share of paranoid individuals, but they are neither so numerous nor so influential as to affect our national policies. Such symptoms of an abnormal nature as we have shown are of the opposite type. Instead of seeking to dominate, we are as a nation more given to isolation. We ask only to be let alone, and we have shrunk from any course of action resembling world leadership. If we were to apply any psychiatric term to our national character, it would have to be descriptive of our isolationist tendencies—what might be called a "schizoid trend."

SCHIZOID CHARACTERISTICS

Schizophrenia, commonly called "dementia praecox," is a disorder most often appearing among adolescents and younger adults and is characterized by what is popularly known as *split personality*. It is a "turtle" type of self-defense. When life becomes too difficult, when conflicts are too severe, the individual can withdraw within his own shell, as it were, and create a world of his own imagining.

Schizophrenia represents an effort of the human personality to effect an emergency adaptation to the overload of life. Victims are able to secure some immediate relief by reverting to earlier and simpler techniques of living. Among the characteristics of the schizoid personality may be mentioned:

Shyness. The earliest schizoid characteristic to show itself often appears in the nursery as an inordinate shyness. This is the key trait of schizophrenia, as suspicion is the key trait of paranoia. To be sure, not all shy children become schizoids. But excessive shyness in adolescence should be carefully watched in order early to detect the possible presence of other schizoid characteristics. As might be suspected, the temperamental trend of the schizoid personality is introvert. Very few extraverts become schizophrenic.

Flight from Reality. In a sense, schizophrenics are individuals who refuse to grow up. They do not want to bear the responsibilities of mature life. They shun the burdens of adulthood. They are able to find

satisfaction in *imagining* things instead of in *doing* them.

Schizoids possess the ability to change the meanings of facts and occurrences. They can retire into a dream world of their own creation and there, amidst their fantasies, supremely enjoy themselves. They seem able to deceive themselves into believing that their imaginary world is real. Their attempt to withdraw from the real world about them is responsible for most of the unhappiness which they encounter.

Frustration and Disappointment. These retiring and sensitive individuals, who suffer from inferiority and insecurity as they grow up, dread competition and shrink from the hard knocks of life. When they become disappointed by their failures in the real world and frustrated in the realization of their dreams and ambitions, they react by plunging still deeper into the unreal world of their imagination.

Isolated Personality. From the nursery on, schizoid individuals represent the *isolated* type of personality. Some of them drift in gradually, but in many cases a crisis of some sort results in a sudden change in personality. They suffer from deficient socialization. They prefer to bury themselves in books rather than play a part in the social life about them. Athletics and sports have little or no appeal for such individuals, and contact with other people is something to be studiously avoided rather than sought after.

Retardation. As the schizoid tendency gains strength, there is a slowing down of all mental and motor activity. The victim eats more and more slowly and becomes equally dilatory in all his customary actions. A bright pupil may suddenly lose all interest in school. Fatigue and loss of appetite may be followed by a rapid decline of interest in everything. Extreme listlessness and moodiness are the usual outcome.

Such persons seem to have surrendered to the fear of growing up. Their development becomes arrested. Every drive for self-realization has been so thwarted that the desire to achieve ambition or attain a successful adulthood has been abandoned. As the condition advances, all the symptoms grow more pronounced. Apathy turns into outright stupidity; thought processes deteriorate; memory becomes defective. The entire personality eventually disintegrates into a condition of insanity. About one half of all the inmates of our state institutions for the insane are schizophrenics. The disorder is manifested in four major types.

Appearance of Delusions. The final crack-up comes when the unfortunate victim of split personality begins to "hear voices." Delusions are rapidly systematized, and sometimes, when the "voices" so direct, schizoids become homicidal, as do paranoids. In some cases schizoids also suffer from hallucinations.

These are the symptoms of schizophrenia which are most relevant to the purpose of the present discussion. They are not to be thought of as a complete list of schizoid characteristics. To supply such a list would lead us far afield from the subject of war and peace. We are here concerned only with those schizoid traits which seem to find a parallel in the political behavior and the international attitudes of the American people. Schizophrenia is really an end result of the accumulation of defective thinking and faulty emotional reaction habits. Its victims fall into dishonest and unfair techniques for meeting life situations. They dream, dodge, substitute, camouflage, brood, blame others, blame poor health, isolate themselves, and seek in every possible way to escape the responsibilities of growing up. In all these tendencies we may see disturbing similarities to the policy of *isolationism* which has played so large a role in our national history.

Before turning to an examination of our national schizoid trends, one further word needs to be said regarding the lot of the individual schizophrenic. His case is not hopeless when subjected to early and intelligent treatment. By means of modern therapy many victims of schizophrenia have been restored to normal living. Many others have been sufficiently helped to enable them to lead fairly happy and useful lives in spite of their twisted, distorted, and isolated personalities.

Various means of treatment have been found effective. One that has had good results (at least temporarily) in a high percentage of cases is the so-called "shock treatment," which is administered by the use of certain chemicals or by the application of electricity. When successful, the effect of this treatment is to "shock" the patient into a renewed sense of reality and to re-establish his grip upon the outside world.

NATIONAL SCHIZOID TRENDS

Nations are like individuals. They are born, pass through infancy and adolescence, and eventually arrive at full adulthood unless prevented by an early death or arrested development. On reaching maturity, nations, like individuals, are expected to assume the responsibilities of national adulthood. Not all of them arrive at this stage of mature responsibility, however. Judged by its record prior to the present war, our own United States is one of those nations that have failed to grow up—to fully attain international adulthood.

Our National Infancy. After passing through a period of colonial gestation, this nation was "born" on July 4, 1776. There was a stormy but normal period of nursery development, with the ordinary infant disorders. The young nation was vital, robust, and promising. We were somewhat shy of "entangling alliances," suspicious of strange nations

and foreign commitments, and disposed to lead a rather exclusive, segregated national existence.

America's Childhood. The United States had a healthy growth after the adoption of the Constitution. There were the usual childhood political disturbances of course. Rhode Island had to be almost forced into the Union. Then there was the war of 1812, followed by the Mexican War, but the country prospered and soon spread over the continent as a result of the Louisiana Purchase and the expansion following the Mexican War.

This early picture of American history is very satisfactory, but portrays a continued isolationist tendency, except in the one instance where we entered into a virtual alliance with Great Britain for the propagation and maintenance of the Monroe Doctrine.

Our National Adolescence. But we began increasingly to experience stress and strain as adolescence progressed. Internal troubles and conflicts and political disagreements began to threaten a national split as complete as the personality split experienced by schizoids. This split finally occurred between the North and South, right down the Mason-Dixon line, and we became embroiled in the devastating civil war. Many factors entered into this internal conflict, but it largely hinged on the doctrine of *self-determination*. It was fought out on the theory of "saving the Union." Abraham Lincoln proved to be a wise

political psychiatrist. He fought a bloody war to establish the principle that neighbors must co-operate. Self-determination cannot be carried to such lengths as to grant unqualified sovereignty to every community or state that wants it.

The later adolescence of this nation was occupied with a period of distressful reconstruction, quite comparable to the re-education of the schizophrenic after a threatened crack-up. There was plenty of trouble following the War between the States. The main disturbances of youth continued; they were both social and economic. There was rapid industrial growth. The end of our national adolescence probably came in the Spanish-American War, after which we found ourselves with new political problems and new national conflicts due to our responsibilities in the Caribbean. We had unexpectedly become a sort of empire, for the chances of war had left the Philippine Islands on our hands.

Our Major National Crisis—The First World War. And then without any choice on our part, just as we were emerging into young national maturity, we were faced with the first serious challenge of our early adulthood. The United States became involved in the first World War. Everything that happened during that struggle and everything attendant upon the ill-fated peace that followed, constituted a challenge to the American people to forsake isolationism; the chance to be a full-grown

nation, to be a nation among the world nations, had definitely come. We were presented with the opportunity of world leadership.

We had successfully met the first crisis of adolescence at the time of the Civil War, but failed in the first major challenge of our early national adulthood. We repudiated the League of Nations—returning to our continental isolation, crawling right back into our shell—indulged our dreams of peace and prosperity, and refused to share the responsibilities of a full-grown nation among nations.

And so the American people, that is, the large majority of them, dreamed their foolish dreams of peace, but only for a short twenty years; and even during this time we had plenty of internal trouble—financial difficulties, unemployment, and depressions. But we went on in the smug satisfaction of isolationism. We were determined to become self-sufficient and to hold ourselves aloof from the turmoil and struggles of the world, to live a national life apart, to pursue our course of international isolation.

Our Second Major Crisis. Yes, we refused to have anything to do with world peace plans following the first World War, but our isolation was not to be left undisturbed for very long. Next came the Hitler crisis. For the second time we were challenged, and for the second time we started to hide behind neutrality, isolation, and the refusal to assume adult national responsibility.

(What would you think of a uniformed member of a municipal police force who, some dark night, chancing upon a fellow officer engaged in "shooting it out" with some bandits, proceeded calmly to declare his neutrality, standing back on his sovereign dignity and refusing actively to intervene on the side of the forces of law and order? But it was just such a strange and inhuman performance that we Americans indulged in when the other civilized world powers were engaged in a life and death struggle with a gang of unscrupulous adventurers bent on conquering the world.)

We hated war. We were determined to maintain our continental seclusion. We still lived in the delusion that the Pacific on the west and the Atlantic on the east were a safe protection against foreign invasion. The country was truly "split" between the isolationists and the interventionists.

But in the midst of this serious dilemma, Providence acts, for "the Most High rules in the Kingdoms of men."

The Pearl Harbor "Shock." As the schizoid, by electric-shock treatment, is often brought back to the world of reality from his psychotic flight into a dream world of his own creation, so in our case, on December 7, 1941, the "god of nations" intervened. We were subjected to a mighty and humiliating national shock. The day before the Japs bombed Pearl Harbor we were a split nation, half isolationist and

half interventionist, but the day after Pearl Harbor we were unified. A miracle had been wrought. This "shock treatment" did overnight for our United States what the electric-shock treatment does for split personalities. This nation became unified as never before for the prosecution of the global war, and we once and for all saw that neither the Atlantic nor the Pacific were in any sense protection against foreign invasion.

To label a nation schizophrenic on the basis of the foregoing evidence would, of course, be absurd. It is not offered as a serious diagnosis, but rather as an interesting and useful analogy. As such, it calls attention to what is beyond question the principal defect of United States foreign policy—our unreasoning reluctance to face the realities of our world situation. We have cherished illusions of security long after the grounds for security ceased to exist. We have clung to our vanishing past out of irrational fear of our present. These happen to be characteristic of schizophrenia—hence the choice of the analogy by way of contrast with the preceding serious diagnosis of German paranoia.

As this is being written, it is too early to prophesy what the future will hold. The voices of pacifism, isolationism, and defeatism are again being heard in our midst. The capacity of some people for self-deception and idle dreaming seems beyond even the tragedy of war to satisfy. The America First Com-

mittee had barely been laid in its well-earned grave when its reincarnation came to life in the Peace Now movement. The words may be different, but the tune is the same. Isolationism is dead, so we are told. But "nationalism" is still very much alive. And what is nationalism but another name for the old dream of American isolation!

Already this war has lasted longer and cost many times as much as the first World War. That war ended in a state of weariness and disillusionment so great that the realities of peace were completely forgotten in the general endeavor to wash our hands of world affairs and dream our pretty dreams in imaginary isolation. Will the far heavier burdens of this war plunge us into proportionately greater depths of national irresponsibility for the peace that is to follow?

If we are to be spared such a fate, it will be because the great majority of Americans hold fast to reality and steadfastly resist the temptation to "take things easy" in the fool's paradise offered by the latest version of isolationism. For that is what isolationism—or nationalism—really is: a fool's paradise in which peace and happiness are to be enjoyed merely for the wishing.

SUMMARY

If Germany is paranoid in its national trends, America tends toward opposite attitudes, toward iso-

lation, which might be looked upon as a "schizoid trend."

Schizophrenia is a disorder of adolescents and younger adults, commonly called "dementia praecox." It is a "turtle" type of self-defense, a form of split personality.

Shyness is the key characteristic of the schizoid personality, and the vast majority are introverts.

Schizoids are in flight from reality. They are burden dodgers. They refuse to grow up. They believe their dream world is real.

Schizoids are much frustrated—they feel inferior and insecure. They dread competition and shun disappointment.

Schizophrenics are *isolated* personalities; they are poorly socialized. They prefer books to athletics.

As schizophrenia progresses, there appears retardation of all common activities. A bright pupil suddenly becomes listless, and every drive for self-realization is thwarted.

The final "crack-up" is characterized by delusions. The schizoid begins to "hear voices" and becomes increasingly dangerous to himself and a serious menace to society.

Schizophrenia is the end result of the accumulation of defective thinking and faulty emotional reactions. Schizoids dream, dodge, camouflage, brood, and blame others for the consequences of their isolation tendencies.

Many schizoids are helped by proper treatment, and one of the most successful measures is some form of "shock" treatment.

Like individuals nations are born, grow-up through adolescence, and attain adulthood. Nations, like individuals, can become schizoid—succumb to isolation tendencies.

Uncle Sam was born July 4, 1776. Our national infancy was uneventful except that we were inordinately shy of "entangling alliances."

The early childhood of America was indicative of robust health and rapid development, notwithstanding a few minor wars.

But American adolescence was characterized by a real crisis. The national unity was split by the Civil War, which was precipitated by the political doctrine of "self-determination."

Our later adolescence, after we recovered from the threat of disruption, was eventful and was terminated by the Spanish-American War and our acquisition of the Philippine Islands.

But the first major crisis of adult America was presented by the first World War. We refused world leadership, we returned to our continental isolation, we declined to accept the responsibilities of a full-grown nation among nations.

And then our second major crisis came with World War II. We hid behind neutrality, and the country was split between isolationists and internationalists.

We were thus in this political "schizoid" state when the Pearl Harbor "shock" aroused us much as the electric shock awakens a stuporous schizophrenic.

And now what of the future? Will Uncle Sam go back to the pre-Pearl Harbor isolationism, or will he continue as a united nation, bravely facing the problems of peace as he now so effectively fights the war?

CHAPTER 5

LESSONS OF THE WAR

EXPERIENCE is the best teacher in all the affairs of men—of nations as well as of individuals. We have all watched with keen regret the slow disintegration of some business organization we have come to respect and admire. Before our very eyes, a vast mercantile establishment, a well-known manufacturing concern, or a bank which we had believed to be as strong as the Egyptian pyramids has suddenly collapsed and gone out of business. The reason for such failures is usually the inability of those in charge to profit by experience in the conduct of their affairs. They fail to adapt their practices to changing conditions and eventually find themselves left behind.

Time changes much in the affairs of nations just as it does in those of business organizations. Scarcely more than a century and a half have elapsed since the thirteen original colonies gained their independence, yet in that short span conditions have so changed that it would be easier today to move an army of fifty thousand men from New York to any spot on the globe than it would have been for Washington in 1776 to transport his small army from New York to southern Georgia. Such changes as these call for tremendous changes in national policy.

It is high time people began observing the same practical common sense in their national affairs as they are accustomed to observing in their business affairs, and not persist blindly in making again and again the same mistakes that have always led to wars in the past.

We have the knowledge of what not to do if we will only agree to use it. But it means re-examining all our old ideas and policies and discarding those which experience has proved to be failures in past history. This requires an open mind and a willingness to think out our problems afresh without the hampering fears of old prejudices and suspicions. A business that sought to carry on today with ideas and prejudices derived from the last century would have small chance of success. The time has come to recognize that this is true for nations also. To conduct international affairs today according to nineteenth-century ideas and prejudices is bound to be just as disastrous. Today's problems call for modern solutions. We must eliminate practices that have outlived their usefulness.

It would be unfair to say that the scholars and statesmen of modern times have failed entirely to realize the importance of the changes that have come over the world. They have tried in several ways to bring about improvements which they hoped would contribute to a better world and make for universal peace.

FUTILITY OF DISARMAMENT

Soon after the end of the first disastrous World War a conference of nations took place at which they all agreed to disarm down to a point where their armies and navies were little stronger than a metropolitan police force. Considerable disarming took place. How did it work? The present war is the answer.

Disarmament failed for two reasons. First, some of the large nations did not enter into it honestly. Japan never thought of disarming. She was determined not to disarm. At the very time she agreed to do so she was making plans to conquer first China, then the Malay Peninsula and the East Indies. After that she meant to grab India and all of eastern Russia. Disarmament was no part of her purpose. Perhaps in the far distant future disarmament may come; but if so, it will be as a *result* rather than as a *cause* of universal peace. For the world as it is now, organized disarmament is not a practicable solution to the problems of war.

IMPERIALISM

Long before disarmament was tried as a means to peace, powerful nations time and again tried imperialism. The thought was, "If we can but overrun and conquer the greater part of the earth, then we shall have peace because we can enforce it." The Romans tried it, and so did Napoleon. Each nearly

succeeded but eventually failed. Hitler too succumbed to imperialistic dreams for Europe. "Let me be your ruler," he said, "and I will give you peace, a New Order in Europe." For a time he got his way; but when at last the other nations began to resist, Hitler abandoned all pretense of peace and began his course of pillage and murder. Imperialism failed because nations will never willingly submit to the rule by force of other nations.

Imperialism makes for war in several ways. First, by generating discontent and rebellion among the subject peoples. This creates situations which tempt rival nations to intervene and thus precipitate war. The existence of one empire arouses competing nations to engage in imperial careers of their own.

One of the forms imperialism takes is economic exploitation of backward or helpless peoples. This can occur without actual military or political conquest, but usually leads to that in the final outcome.

Imperialism often masks under the innocent guise of national defense. Thus Germany began its invasions of the little countries of Europe and even of Russia, on the trumped-up necessity of self-defense. In the same spirit certain Americans now demand far-flung bases for our national defense.

SUICIDAL PACIFISM

Pacifism and isolationism have been advocated by many as the way to peace; both have proved to be

worse than futile. Twice they have nearly brought our nation to the verge of destruction.

Pacifism is for those weak souls who are willing to sacrifice everything for an empty peace. On the surface of a stagnant pool is peace of a sort, but when a great man was once asked to describe his idea of peace, he took the questioner to a rushing, roaring cataract and, pointing to a tiny bird reposing on a branch not three feet above the brink, said: "There—that is my idea of peace."

Pacifism puts too high a value upon the mere absence of war. There are other values equally essential to civilization: truth, justice, liberty, love, kindness, righteousness. Lasting peace is obtainable only in a world where these higher values are secure. They cannot be secure in a world which permits nations, just because they are strong, to trample upon their weaker neighbors. Pacifism is self-defeating because, in making an absolute of peace, it weakens the devotion which men have for the other values without which peace cannot endure. To enjoy genuine, lasting peace the world must find a way to guarantee the security of these other values as well.

China is perhaps the most outstanding example of the fallacy of pacifism. She is one of the largest nations in the world; her population numbers into the hundreds of millions. The desire of her people for centuries has been to cultivate their crops, to rear their children, and to honor their ancestors.

When Japan attacked, China resembled a great, flabby, potentially powerful man being attacked by a muscular little bully trained to the highest degree. General Stilwell says the Chinese soldier makes a very formidable fighter when he is armed and trained. He is not a coward. But China believed in pacifism. Had it not been for the chain of events that brought England and the United States into the war as her allies, all of China must eventually have been overrun and conquered. Her pacifism rendered her defenseless against a small but aggressive enemy. If anyone wishes to know the fate that the Japs had in store for China, let him read *Secret Agent of Japan* by Amleto Vespa.

The Japs went into the territory which they were to rename Manchukuo with the avowed purpose of defending innocent citizens against Chinese bandits and Russian outlaws. What they really did was to hire hordes of these bandits and outlaws to do their secret bidding. Their purpose was pillage, corruption, and finally absolute conquest.

The greater part of the Japs living in Manchukuo were of the worst type. They were cutthroats and robbers, keepers of opium dens, houses of prostitution, and gambling joints. Since there were not enough of these people in the province to carry out the diabolical plan of the Japs to render Manchukuo powerless by corruption, more were imported from Japan.

There were many rich and powerful men in Manchukuo, some Europeans, some Jews, and some Chinese. These must be "reduced." For this purpose the Japs hired outlaws and bandits to kidnap these men and their sons and hold them for ransom. The kidnapers were always Chinese or Russian, never Japanese, but of the millions of dollars collected in this manner more than half went into the Japanese treasury, for after all "Japan was poor."

When this state of affairs had gone on for some time, the Lytton Commission of the League of Nations visited Manchukuo and sought to investigate. Vast preparations were made for their coming. More than a thousand persons were arrested because it was thought by the Japs that they might try to tell the whole truth to the Commission.

Bandits and secret agents were posted everywhere. When the Commission arrived, a great show was put on by a "happy people." The dozen or so honest citizens who tried to get near the Commission to present their side of the story were quickly seized, whisked away, and executed. In spite of all this, the Commission did learn much of the truth, but nothing came of it. The Japs are still in Manchukuo. We can only imagine what life there is like today.

This is the story of a people that chose pacifism as the way to peace. What happened to them is a sample of what every people must expect if it trusts too blindly in the peaceful intentions of its neighbors.

THE FOLLY OF ISOLATIONISM

Another of the national policies that has failed to prevent war is isolationism. Before we entered the present war, millions who believed that we should have no part in the war said: "We are nearly self-sufficient. Goods we *must* import form only a small fraction of our real needs. Arm? Yes! But let's stay at home. Let whoever wants to attack us come to America."

But life is not lived that way. None of the original thirteen colonies could have taken that attitude. No more can we. The world is too small. Sooner or later we should be undermined from within or overwhelmed by a combination of hostile enemies from without.

It is not good that man should live alone. No more is it good or possible for a nation to live alone. With this plan we might have a national peace, but never a world peace. And such a national peace would be dubious and short-lived.

It takes only two nations to start a war. To make and maintain a lasting peace all the nations of the world must co-operate. In the century and a half of its existence, our nation has been drawn into every major war that has occurred anywhere on the globe. This was not because we wanted to go to war. We did not. It was because to stay out of the war was impossible without the sacrifice of certain of our vital interests. Among these interests vital to our

own continued safety were the security of those ideals of truth, freedom, justice, righteousness, and all the other virtues in which our civilization is grounded. For us to stand cravenly back and let these civilized values be trampled underfoot anywhere would have been to prepare the seeds of our own eventual destruction as a free and civilized people. In a world as interdependently constituted as ours peace cannot be safe anywhere unless and until it is safe everywhere. To imagine that we can remain an island of peace in a world at war is to imitate the proverbial ostrich. Our own national experience conclusively brands such a policy as utterly fallacious.

The world can no longer afford to treat the problems of war and peace as of minor concern, second in importance to the separate interests of individual nations. That was possible in the past because wars were comparatively limited in their over-all effect. At most they involved the destruction of defeated nations only. Today, war has grown so far-reaching and devastating that it threatens the destruction of civilization itself. To continue playing with the question of war and peace is as dangerous as playing with dynamite. It must be faced seriously and courageously.

Ever since Christ came into the world preaching the gospel of universal peace, that vision has been one of the ideals ever shining before men. But today universal peace is more than a shining ideal. It is a

practical necessity. Without it civilization cannot long endure. Peace is the indispensable condition of every other good—economic, political, cultural, or spiritual. We must win the peace this time, for if we do not we may never have another opportunity. Such is the seriousness of our situation.

We must therefore be willing and able to pay the price which lasting peace is going to demand of us. That is the first and most essential lesson we should have learned. Peace is not to be won for the mere asking nor kept for the mere wishing. It can only be had for a price. The price is high, but not too high when weighed against the terrible cost of future wars.

DELUSIONS OF SOVEREIGNTY

Much is being said and written these days about the sovereignty of nations. Many people are prone to magnify the degree of sovereignty which nations really possess. Not one is completely sovereign. The United States, Great Britain, and Russia are the most powerful nations in the world. But they are not completely masters of their own destinies, as is proved by the fact that they have all been compelled against their own wishes to lay aside the pursuits of peace and to engage in an all-out war. Germany and Japan set out to assert their unlimited sovereignty within their respective spheres. The illusoriness of such a goal is now fully apparent even to them. It should be equally evident to other nations, including our

own, whose citizens mistakenly adhere to the outworn concept of unlimited sovereignty.

In the earlier days of the emergence of democratic government, the original idea was to take sovereignty away from one man—king or emperor—and to transfer it to all men—the nation. So far the idea was good, but presently the concept became a mere political dogma. Presently the politicians began to take sovereignty away from the people and wield it very much as had their predecessors, the kings and emperors, and now this fetish of “sovereignty” has become a democratic political religion.

When we give a citizen of a democracy his personal liberty, it is not unqualified. He does not have the right to use it in a way that deprives his fellow citizens of any of their liberties. Some day nations must recognize that their so-called sovereignty does not give them any license to subjugate other people and rob them of their independence.

Individuals in a community are not allowed to live their lives independent of law and order, and no longer can the nations of the earth hope to enjoy a prosperous existence while maintaining this delusion of unlimited sovereignty. In the case of either an individual or a nation, all attempts to live above law can only end in the employment of brute force—in the case of nations, war.

The idea that any nation can enjoy unqualified sovereignty is a political delusion. The manner in

which nations are organized, the way men live and carry on at the present time, make it utterly impossible for any nation, no matter how great and strong, to go on entertaining the delusion that it can do just as it pleases and enjoy perfect liberty without recognizing its international obligations, without submitting to the limitations and restrictions of international law.

National sovereignty can be secured only in so far as all nations agree to respect and defend the equal sovereignty of all other nations. No nation, not even our own, can hope to become or remain powerful enough to maintain its own sovereignty without the assistance of other friendly powers. We cannot reasonably expect such assistance for ourselves unless we are willing to extend like assistance to them. That means voluntarily accepting certain limits upon our own national sovereignty. But, since wars such as we are now engaged in impose far greater restrictions upon our sovereignty, we stand to gain more than we lose in the end. Just as individuals gain greater freedom for themselves by voluntarily accepting the necessary restraints of society, so may nations possess greater sovereignty—and possess it more securely—through voluntary association with other peace-loving nations.

THE FETISH OF NATIONALISM

A delusion closely related to unlimited sovereignty is extreme nationalism. By this term is meant the

tendency to exalt one's own nation without regard for the rights and well-being of other nations. It asserts itself in such callous utterances as: "Our nation, may she ever be right—but our nation, right or wrong!" It takes concrete form in policies of national self-sufficiency, high protective tariffs, non-co-operation in matters of international commerce and finance, intolerance of foreign people and their ideas.

A healthy concern for the genuine interests of one's own nation is one of man's noblest attributes and every nation is fully justified in nourishing such concern among its citizens by every legitimate means at its disposal. But for any nation—as in the case of Germany and Japan—or any group of individuals—as in the case of certain jingo elements in our own country—to put their own national interests ahead of every consideration of international decency and fairness is not only to dishonor their nation's reputation for fair play and thereby make enemies, but also to plant the seeds of retaliation and conflict throughout the world. Such a course can lead only to war, not to peace. It has been a cause of war in the past and it will continue to cause war so long as nations persist in pursuing their own interests without due regard for the equal interests of all other nations and peoples.

The conception of nationalism has undergone a great change. It has become a political fetish. A

statesman must be possessed of rare courage to stand up and publicly denounce these long-entrenched concepts of nationalism. But that is what more and more of our politicians and statesmen must do before there can be much real progress toward a lasting peace. If a man proclaims himself to be the greatest person on earth, we either ridicule him or lock him up in a state institution; but if this same citizen becomes patriotically intoxicated and goes about shouting that we are the greatest nation on earth, then we applaud him and may even proceed to elect him to high and honored public office.

This false brand of nationalism persists largely because it has never been sensibly attacked. True, the Christian churches on the one hand and numerous labor organizations on the other have sought to promote better international relations, but those efforts have hitherto failed. Today men are confused and heartsick because they do not know how to escape the clutches of entrenched nationalism in their efforts to bring about more satisfactory international relations.

Nationalism, or sovereignty, has really become a sort of pagan god to many peoples. While the forty-eight American states talk about "state sovereignty," they know it is only in a limited sense that they are sovereign, since these forty-eight states are subordinate in many matters to the Federal government. In this same way must the nations of this world ul-

timately unite and associate themselves in a global government.

For generations political freedom and human liberty have been safeguarded by the philosophy of democracy and the doctrine of Christianity, but during the past half of a century both of these influences have been diminishing as controlling factors in national behavior and international relations. Political liberalism tended to become political dogma, and Christianity became more and more formalized and institutionalized. For a generation democracy has been sickly; it has not been growing; it has not kept up with the industrial development and mechanical progress of the materialistic world. Referring to this decline of vigilance on the part of liberty-loving people, someone has truly said that for two decades "self-government has been slowly committing suicide."

No longer may the citizens of a democracy stand by complacently while the enemies of democracy openly proclaim their intention to overthrow its machinery and destroy its institutions.

DICTATORS AND DEMOCRACY

The recent ascendancy of the dictators, from Japan to Germany and Italy, does not in any way presage the downfall of the democracies, but it may very well indicate that the democracies have grown careless of freedom and indifferent to liberty. This inter-

national ascendancy of political gangsters does very definitely prove that the democracies have been so preoccupied with their supposed pursuits of peace that they have been unwilling to fight for the preservation of democratic freedom.

Citizens of the democracies have forgotten that democracy is a way of life for which their fathers fought and died in order that they might establish and bequeath it to them. Even too many Americans have failed to recognize that our American way of life is something which had to be established by the sacrifice and devotion of our national fathers; and we must awaken anew to the realization that the citizens of a democracy must ever be on the alert to defend it against attacks from the inside by subversive minorities and from the outside by aggressive conquerors.

We shall have a great many good people against us at the start. These we must convert to our cause by sound reasoning. This has been called the age of reason. Therefore, in this matter we must be guided by reason rather than by our emotions.

We shall also be opposed by many selfish people. More people than we would believe possible are getting a grand time out of the war. Thousands who have earned "big money" during the war will want to go right on. "Why bother with the peace?" they will say. "Let's build a million homes, manufacture five million cars, have a big financial spree. Give

us five years. That's all we ask. Let us laugh and be merry, for tomorrow we die." Nothing can be done about these people. They are beyond help.

We shall also be opposed by hordes of selfish politicians loath to give up any part of their powers. Such men as these should never have been elected. Our government will never become permanently effective until it ceases to put ignorant and incompetent individuals in high political offices. Among the earlier health commissioners of Chicago was a livery stable proprietor, but today no man could be health commissioner of this city unless he were a licensed M.D., qualified to practice medicine. Judges are members of the bar; ministers are in general qualified graduates of theological seminaries; engineers are trained in technological institutions. But our public officials, big and little, are chosen with little regard for their essential qualifications. The time must come, and let us hope it will be soon, when no one will be allowed to take public office who has not been trained in a school of statemanship and administration.

WISDOM FOR SMALL NATIONS

Another of the ideas calling for re-examination is that of *self-determination*. When the war has been won and men begin to rearrange the map of the world, what factors shall guide them in determining the number of states or nations to be allotted space on that map?

Previous to World War I the position of small states, such as Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland, was fairly secure. In settling the political and economic problems of the continents, they were largely ignored. In case of war they were considered to be neutrals.

The first World War changed all that. At the very beginning Germany violated the neutrality of Belgium. Belgium with her tiny army fought back and helped save Paris. Later Greece was invaded. Other small countries were induced to take sides in that war. Now no one expects the small states to remain neutral unless they choose to do so. Everyone knows how difficult it has been for Spain, Switzerland, Sweden, and Turkey to maintain their neutrality in this war.

After World War I peace was made, and President Wilson had a great deal to do with that. He began with the declaration that "Every people has a right to choose the sovereignty under which they shall live." (*Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson: The New Democracy*, page 187.)

What Wilson apparently meant was that a group of people speaking a common language and having common customs might say: "We wish to be independent." If they did say this, he held that they should be allowed to form an independent state.

Wilson did not know that in Eastern Europe the matter of a common tongue and common customs did

not entirely determine the natural boundaries of a state. Indeed, quite the opposite. Yet he and his associates made the boundaries fit the language which populations spoke, so much so that a contemporary historian called the new political frontiers of Europe "Wilsonian." So carefully drawn were these frontiers that, of the total population of the continent, only three per cent lived under alien rule. In the view of this historian, no previous European frontiers had been so satisfactory, judged by the test of self-determination.

(It is almost tragic to contemplate how President Wilson so blundered in this matter of self-determination when he well knew that the civil war had been waged in his own country for the express purpose of denying self-determination to the states of the Southern Confederacy. Every state in the American Union has been finally and forever denied the right of self-determination.)

But by the test of time and experience, those frontiers have not been satisfactory. Hitler of course exaggerated his account of conditions when he attacked small nations on the ground that they were unfair to his German minorities within their borders. Still there are far too many small states. They are ignored economically, are unable to protect themselves, and in time of war become pawns for large nations to push about. In the interests of world peace the number of small nations must be reduced.

Wilson appears to have erred in his premises, for as Carr points out (*Conditions of Peace*, page 50) "There can be no absolute right of self-determination any more than there can be an absolute right to do as one pleases in a democracy."

There was a time when England, Ireland, Wales, and Scotland were all independent states. And many wars were the result. Now a Scotchman remains a Scotchman, a Welshman a Welshman, and an Englishman an Englishman, but they all have the same king and fight under the same flag. They have gained much and lost little by uniting.

As Carr says, "Men may *determine* themselves into larger as readily as into smaller units." (*Conditions of Peace*, page 63.) It seems probable that when the war is over and peace is being made, the peace council will this time endeavor to persuade the smaller nations either to regroup themselves into larger states or join themselves to larger states already formed.

There can be no lasting peace so long as unlimited sovereignty, extreme nationalism, imperialism, and unrealistic ideas of self-determination continue to govern the foreign policies of nations. Some better basis for international relations must be instituted if there is to be an end to war.

As in many other matters, it seems probable that much of the groundwork for these changes can be done by the personal representatives of Great Britain,

Russia, and the United States, even before the final complete victory is won.

SUMMARY

Experience is the best teacher, provided men and nations are willing to adapt their practices to an ever-changing world.

Disarmament will not prevent war. The relative disarmament following the first World War proves that effective disarmament in the future will be a result of peace rather than a cause.

Imperialism failed to bring peace. No people ever willingly submit to being ruled by other nations. Equality of armament is a delusion.

Pacifism failed to bring peace. There are other supreme values besides peace, such as truth, justice, liberty, and righteousness. There can be no lasting peace that does not also guarantee these other values.

China illustrates the fate of a truly pacifist nation. She was helpless against Japanese military aggression. The horrible fate of Manchukuo testifies eloquently to the folly of depending on peaceful intentions.

Isolationism also failed to prevent war. From the first World War to the second, America was predominantly isolationist. Nevertheless, we are in this war. It takes only two nations to start a war. To make and maintain a lasting peace all nations must cooperate.

The global wars of today threaten the very existence of civilization. Peace is no longer just an ideal, it has become a necessity if civilization is to endure.

The idea of unlimited sovereignty is a delusion. All nations are more or less interdependent. No citizen of a democracy has unqualified liberty. He must equally respect the liberties of all other citizens.

The individual cannot live his life independent of law and order. Neither can nations go on forever ignoring the demands of international law and order. National sovereignty is secure only in so far as all nations agree to respect and defend the equal sovereignty of all other nations.

Extreme nationalism must give way to the recognition of the equal rights of other nations, and to international good will and co-operation. Nationalism has become a political fetish. As the forty-eight so-called sovereign states delegate certain powers to the Federal government, so must the nations of earth delegate certain powers to the international government.

Democracy and Christianity have failed to safeguard political freedom and human liberty. Christianity has become institutionalized, and for two decades self-government has been slowly but certainly committing suicide.

The ascendancy of dictators proves that the democracies have been so preoccupied with the pursuit of peace that they have been unwilling to fight for the preservation of freedom.

The plans for permanent peace will be opposed by greedy profiteers and selfish politicians, and many good people who are wholly ignorant of what democracy has cost.

The political officeholders of the future should be graduates of schools of statesmanship.

Self-determination is a fallacy when applied to every tiny nation on the face of the earth. The mistakes along this line made at the end of World War I must not be repeated.

There can be no lasting peace so long as unlimited sovereignty, extreme nationalism, imperialism, and unrealistic ideas of self-determination continue to govern the foreign policies of nations.

•

•

CHAPTER 6

FOUNDATIONS OF PEACE

CAN there be anyone left in the world who still doubts that war is sheer madness and must eventually be abolished if civilization is not to go down in ruin? When we contemplate the awful carnage of modern warfare and weigh its appalling cost against the blessings of peace, how can we balk at paying any price within reason and honor that the future of civilization may demand?

The terrible conflict now being waged holds forth one hope which could make all the bloodshed, suffering, and destruction worth while. That hope is that out of this frightful experience the world will have learned enough to make future global wars impossible. Certainly some grounds exist for such a hope.

The political, social, and industrial machinery of all Europe and even Asia has been so thoroughly broken up and disintegrated that the victors in the present war will possess an unparalleled opportunity for world reorganization. The chance will be theirs to make a fresh start in the resettlement of the age-old problems responsible for past wars. The United Nations are confronted with the challenge to create a new world order in which the mechanisms of peace will supplant the mechanisms of war.

THE TECHNIQUES OF PEACE

As we try to picture the period immediately following the end of the war, we know the whole world must stand appalled at the destruction that is being wrought—cities in ruins, homes destroyed, a great part of the youth of the present generation killed or maimed for life, victor and vanquished alike so heavily in debt that our children for generations to come must groan under the burden of taxes. This is the picture that we shall face. There can be but one sane conclusion: "This must never happen again." All the world will be praying for peace.

When the war is over, it will be the old story of "those that have, and those that have not," but this time those that have must not wrap their arms about what they have and say, "These things are ours and ours alone." The need will be too great. We shall all be in the position of the citizens of a community that has been devastated by a cyclone. They ask one another, "What have you that I can use until I get on my feet again? And what can I give you?"

All nations are painfully aware of the extent to which they are interdependent, one upon another, for the necessities of civilized existence, for progress in civilization, for security, and for peace. The airplane, the radio, the increased knowledge of geography, the widening contacts with other peoples and races—all these will contribute to a realization that this is indeed "one world," and that we must all

find a way to get along in it if we are to continue to exist.

Year by year, the speed with which we travel has dwarfed our world. If we may eat breakfast at home and dinner with another in his home, that person is our neighbor even though he be two thousand miles away. And we must treat him as a neighbor, not as a total stranger whom we may legitimately seek to outwit in a business deal or allow to starve while we live only for ourselves. Not alone travel, but radio, moving pictures—all modern improvements—have brought men and nations closer together. All mankind is but one large family.

Abraham Lincoln once aptly remarked that in his day the United States had reached that place where it could no longer continue "half slave and half free." The facilities of communication, the acceleration of travel, have reached that place in the world's history where no longer can the world go on "half slave and half free."

But the members of any family must be possessed of a generous spirit. Toys that are not shared are often destroyed by those who have none. We have more "toys" than any other nation in the world—more automobiles and more airplanes, more radios, moving-picture machines, refrigerators, sewing machines, and vacuum cleaners. A hundred years ago we did without these things. Most parts of the world do without them still. We must manage somehow

to help these other parts of the world enjoy the same benefits of civilization that we do.

It is not a matter of giving but of trading. And that is harder than giving. We must send real experts into many countries, not to see how much money can be made, but to show all these people how to produce more goods for their own enjoyment as well as for exchange with us for the things they want and need. If we do not approach all these postwar problems in a spirit of fairness, if not altruism, we must in the end fail, and the price will be another devastating global war. We must never forget that greed, suspicion, jealousy, and hate are destructive agencies. They destroy not only their objects but those who harbor them as well.

WHILE DEMOCRACY SLUMBERED

We must never forget that this war came after a period of severe depression. When the hopes and aspirations of mankind were at low ebb, a few selfish and half-mad leaders of three nations said to the military cliques of those nations, "See! Democracy is dead. The citizens of the democratic nations are soft. They no longer believe in the doctrines of freedom and peace. Come! We will attack them. They will be bowled over like tenpins! Then we shall rule the world."

Democracy was not dead; it was only sleeping. Those men now know this all too well. We have

every reason to hope that after the war is over and we can take a long, free breath again, there will be a reflowering of democratic ideas and practices such as the world has never known. France will again believe in the democratic way of life. Italy is almost sure to join in. A united China will become one of the greatest and most powerful republics the world has ever known. The Soviet Union is now moving rapidly toward democracy. It is to be hoped that this war has but burned the dross away from the democratic spirit that has always been in the hearts of English-speaking peoples the world over. If this be true, then the war will not have been waged in vain.

The victory of the United Nations will go far toward restoring the supremacy of democratic principles, international law, truth, fair dealing, and friendship. A new appreciation of the value of such things will tend to replace the cynicism that preceded this war. The world will see more need of wise co-operation to preserve them.

To America the year 1944 will be the "zero hour." This much has been promised by our practical, straight-thinking leaders. Many a gold service star will shine on the breast of a saddened mother when 1944 is done. The whole world will long for lasting peace as it has never longed before. If only this powerful emotion can be guided into proper channels, the gains will be great. It must not be shunted off

into sentimental pacifism or self-defeating isolationism. Instead, it must be guided into realistic thinking and acting.

If a workable plan for lasting peace can be mapped out—and we believe it can—now is the time to map it. And the time for presenting it is not after the war, but now. Emery Reves states it this way (*Reader's Digest*, January, 1943): "Always in history, great revolutionary changes take place during wars. We must act now, during the present war, because no military victory can give us the guarantee that it will create a reasonable world. It was one of the great tragedies of our time that the democratic nations and the democratic governments did not grasp—and still do not grasp—the fact that a gigantic political struggle is going on, of which the military war is merely one symptom."

We have been told that at the end of World War I, our soldiers, even though they came as conquerors, were given as cordial a welcome by the plain working people of Germany—who never really knew what the war was about anyway—as they were by the people of France. We dare believe that this was because in every American's breast there abides a spirit of love, peace, and good will, breathed into him by the air of a free land.

This spirit is not dead today. If every smiling Yank who marches into any conquered territory, be it enemy territory or the lands of nations overrun and

enslaved by the enemy, carries in his pocket and his brain a workable plan for lasting peace, we shall have millions of missionaries for peace. This, in the end, must become a veritable crusade for peace. And if ever the world was ripe for a real crusade, it is now.

THE MISSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Day by day, with rising wonder and consternation, we watch the mounting costs of this war. One authority estimates that at the end of the war the total debts of the United Nations will be more than five hundred billion dollars, and that aside from the loss of life the total cost will exceed the united wealth of the Axis nations. To say five hundred billions of dollars conveys no message to us. It is too huge a sum to think of with understanding and intelligence. One thing is sure, a debt of that magnitude cannot be cut down to reasonable size in a single generation without unusual, perhaps unbearable, sacrifices by every man, woman, and child.

And this is not all. The "scorched earth" policy has aided us in defeating the enemy, but the homes, the farms, the cities that have been "scorched" are for the most part United Nations' farms, homes, and cities. Century-old homes, very dear to their owners, have been destroyed. So too have ancient churches and cathedrals. Rare and ancient objects of art, paintings, sculptures, whole libraries, and great col-

leges have gone up in smoke. Shall we see this in our own land in some later global war? God forbid! We *must* have peace!

There is much encouragement in a close study of the setup of the United Nations. For your study I recommend two inexpensive volumes: *The United Nations, What They Are*, and *The United Nations On the Way* (World Citizens Association).

It may well be—indeed, it seems entirely likely—that around this organization of our United Nations will be erected our first edifice for lasting peace. Certain it is that they already have within their ranks nations powerful enough to carry through any plans for peace they choose to undertake, provided only that they remain united to the war's end, and, more important still, after the war is over.

Russia, Great Britain, the United States, and China, four strong nations already associated with some twenty others, make a powerful array. And their ranks are swelling—will swell more and more as the enslaved peoples are freed.

The United Nations began co-operating before the United States was in the war, when Roosevelt and Churchill met to draw up the Atlantic Charter. Later they put forward the "Four Freedoms" as a sort of "International Declaration of Independence." As against the Axis nations' declaration for absolute despotic power over all men, they declared that every human individual has a right to: "Freedom of

speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear." These form a broad, far-reaching program. Though they include much, for the time being each individual man may interpret their meaning as he thinks best, but above all, they do mean that he is to be free.

Time has seen the bond between the United Nations immeasurably strengthened. Each conference has offered its stout strand to strengthen that bond. We have been told little about what was decided at Cairo by Churchill, Roosevelt, and Chiang Kai-shek, and even less of the decisions reached at Teheran. But we are sure that in these two conferences the bond between those nations was so strengthened that it will last till the war's victorious end. The Axis powers know this, and tremble.

For the moment, the United Nations are pooling their resources for the gigantic struggle that lies ahead. Every furnace, every motor, every farm and mine, every ounce of power belonging to any of these nations is now the property of all, to be used on the soil of the nation that for the moment needs it most. There is no thought of "This is mine," "That is yours," "This you will pay for, and I shall pay for that." More than half the population of the world has for the time being formed itself into an international organization dedicated to a common cause, the defeat of the enemies of mankind and the preservation of civilization.

It is very possible that these same United Nations may be considerably augmented by the nations that are beginning to see the light. They may be welded into a great machine for the preservation of the future peace. However, this depends upon several factors.

IN WAR PREPARE FOR PEACE

One must not forget that the world is now in the midst of a great conflagration. At such times, men, and even whole nations, may rise to great heights. We have but to recall the heroism and fortitude of the civilian population of London during their trial by bombing. War changes our psychology, but it does not stay changed. It is quite inevitable and not at all wrong that we should, to a degree at least, fall back into our former ways after the danger is past—and the way of no nation is perfect.

We must consider some of the problems involved, but first, even before our war psychology has begun to drop like scales from our eyes, we must consider the peace we are to make with our enemies.

To begin with, the peace must be just, if anyone can be found who knows what is just. There is little we can do to make the enemy realize the futility and wickedness of war. With their cities in ruins, their sons slain, their leaders discredited, they will be reminded of all war's horrors often enough.

Shall we ask reparations? Considering that the damage done has been more than their total wealth,

and that their own cities are in ruins, there is probably little they could do. But what they can do, they should be compelled to do, as token reparation for the great and needless devastation they have wrought upon other nations.

There should be no thought of revenge in the settlement. If the German people, especially the children, are hungry, we should feed them, and certainly should not, as in the last war, maintain our blockade for months after the end of the struggle.

For the good of all the people of the enemy nations as well as for that of the rest of the world, we should demand that their paranoid and criminal leaders appear before a just tribunal, by which they should be punished or executed in accordance with their just deserts.

When all this has been done, and when their arms have been melted into the instruments of peace and their military clique absorbed into honest occupations, we should do all in our power to see that these nations are prepared in the shortest possible time to take their rightful places in the world of commerce and industry, with but one restriction—that they live up to the rules of fair play and honest trade.

MAKING A PERMANENT PEACE

In the marking of boundaries and the forming of federations, concessions by all parties will have to be made. The small nations will not be the only ones

to make concessions. If after the war China feels that Hongkong should be given back to her in return, perhaps, for payment made to the British for their improvement of the island, Britain may be called upon to comply. If the Dutch East Indies ask to be made a republic, something will need to be done about that; and Russia may have to make some real concessions in regard to her boundary lines.

Will the large nations as well as the small accept sacrifices in the name of peace? If not, then the name United Nations must become only a memory after the war is over, and some other organization must be formed for the promotion of lasting peace.

The settlement of boundary questions and the rights of minorities and small nations must be carried out in a spirit of fairness to all but with due regard for the imperative need of stability and peace. Not every claim of every minority or nation can be allowed, since many of them conflict one with another and with the need for peace. There must be adjustment and compromise, plus a willingness on the part of all to accept some sacrifice in the interest of peace.

Quite as vital as the forming of the postwar boundaries and the regrouping of states will be the changes that must be made in our manner of handling trade and commerce. There are many people who believe that one important cause of these world wars has been the sharp practices indulged in by the traders and shippers of great nations.

All this must come to an end. There must be some peaceable arrangement for the fair division of trade and for the distribution of raw materials. If all this trading were done on a twenty-mile square tract of land by honest and peace-loving men, no insurmountable difficulties would be encountered. The handling of the commerce of the seven seas is not quite so simple as that, but it can and must be worked out by wise, clear-thinking, and honest men.

There must be an increasing measure of economic justice both *within* and *among* nations. Within nations more attention must be given to the accomplishment of better standards of living, health, and education. Doing this will remove much of the discontent that renders whole populations sympathetic with violence and war. Among nations, fairer access to the raw materials and markets of the world must be promoted. This means lowering tariff and exchange barriers and gradually eliminating obstacles to trade, whatever their source.

In the world of the future, gigantic military armaments of single nations must be slowly but surely reduced, and more and more they will have to yield precedence to *armed forces belonging to the whole world*, to which all nations contribute their fair quota of men and fighting machines.

All this sounds almost Utopian, but it is not impossible, and we should like to see these same United Nations that are fighting this war so magnificently

undertake the herculean task of organizing the post-war world and of maintaining peace therein. They have done such a wonderful job of sticking together and fighting side by side that we have high hopes of their succeeding in this other field—the winning of a permanent peace.

Hoover has pointed out (*Problems of Lasting Peace*, page 248) that “the sole possessor or possessors of military air power could stop anyone from going to war. And international action to enforce peace would be enormously simplified.” He goes on to say that nonmilitary planes are now so different in design from military types that they would not be effective in air battles.

Perhaps the assigning of military planes exclusively to our international police force dedicated to peace may in the end be the answer. For the present, however, one finds it difficult to picture Stalin, Churchill, Chiang Kai-shek, or even Roosevelt agreeing to such a revolutionary proposal; so perhaps that will have to wait. But in all these discussions we must not forget that before the war nations were spending the staggering sum of twenty billion dollars annually for national defense. In time, humanity must be relieved of this awful load, plus the five-hundred-billion-dollar global war debt, or be utterly crushed. When the order sounds, “Cease firing!” we will truly be standing at the crossroads.

THE DAWN OF A NEW AGE

There must be a greatly increased willingness to co-operate in the settlement of international problems. The habit of trying to settle such disagreements merely on the basis of superior force must give way to their solution by negotiation and arbitration. In other words, the ideal of international law and justice must come to prevail in the affairs of nations. The anarchy which has heretofore reigned must be replaced by the rule of law and order.

Attitudes of friendship and good will must gradually gain the ascendancy over those of suspicion, rivalry, and hate. "It is in the hearts of men that the foundations of peace must be laid," says King Gustav of Sweden.

Very often, after war, when men's souls have been attuned to fear and hate for years, some type of spiritual revival sweeps over a nation, or even the entire world. Some such revival may come after this war. There are indications of this even now.

Should this revival spend itself in a spontaneous outburst of religious emotion that burns out like a red flare, it will do little good. Should it, on the other hand, be definitely connected up with those high spiritual values, truth, justice, righteousness, and peace, men will have found something fine and inspiring to live for, and will gladly make the sacrifices necessary and exert the energy needed to over-

come the evil forces that lead to war. Whether the old religions can supply the spiritual power which the world so badly needs depends upon whether they will take up the job of *leading* men rather than *following* them.

We have been assuming thus far that the whole setup of the United Nations may be carried over bodily into peacetime, and that it alone will be able to solve all the peacetime problems. But let us realize that the reverse may be true. It is possible that the statesmen who are doing such a fine job of conducting the war are so close to this titanic struggle that their eyes are blinded to the problems of peace. MacIvers, in his book *Towards an Abiding Peace*, suggests that this may have been, in part, the trouble with the peace settlement after World War I. Those who sat down at the peace table had only just left the war table. They had been constantly in contact with officers whose business it was to make war, and they were unable to see clearly what the problems of peace really were.

This same thing may be true of the United Nations' leaders. We may find it expedient to select others for this new task, or we may at least wish to bring some new faces to the peace table.

Even if all the people in all lands should have the best will in the world regarding permanent peace, we cannot have real peace without the necessary machinery to make it function. It is as if we were

starting to establish law and order in a rough Alaskan mining camp. All the people may desire law and order except a few gangsters and gamblers, but there can be no law and order until a leader has been chosen, officers of the law employed, and courts set up. The enforcement of peace will require an armed force, drawn from all participating states, and the establishment of some form of court of arbitration to settle all disputes. Even the most favorable conditions cannot avail unless they are implemented with appropriate institutions to put that will into effect.

These institutions must be grounded in reality. They cannot be artificial creations without roots in the actual lives of nations and peoples. We must start from where we are, not from where we wish we were. Let us not make the mistake of trying to reach the millenium of perfect world order in one sudden leap. We must be content to make progress slowly.

In some way or other leaders of each state must be chosen to assist in working out the rules that shall govern action. These rules should be simple in form, with, for the moment, but one purpose in mind—the establishment of permanent peace. There should be some manner of passing on each delegation. Each group should truly represent the people of its state.

The type of world order which should follow this war will not be created by pacts, treaties, pacifist

leagues, or even by the sincere efforts of well-meaning idealists. It can be brought into immediate existence only by military power, and it will be made permanently strong and effective by the new and global sovereignty of international law, backed up by an international police force, which will always be mobilized, ready on an instant's notice in case a national gangster challenges the peace of nations.

It is highly significant that in a large municipality the policemen and the sheriff are referred to as "peace officers." When war is once brought under control of international authority, the international police forces will then be properly known as "peace armies."

The idea of *equality of armament* is a military delusion. What would we think of the mayor of Chicago if he were to advocate that every criminal should carry a gun of the same caliber as that carried by the policemen? Any sane person knows that the right procedure is to arm the police with the best weapons obtainable and at the same time, as far as possible, to prevent the criminal underworld from obtaining weapons of any kind. How straight the average citizen can think about these matters of armament, war, and peace as they concern the equities of local police power! Why must we think so loosely and illogically about providing an international police power?

This is what it all sums up to: The only way we can prevent illegal wars—which now bring us a world

war every twenty-five years—is to be adequately prepared and ready to act instantly when it is necessary to fight a *legal* war—a war to prevent illegal wars of aggression.

Permanent and abiding peace will not come to this mundane sphere in a thousand years unless we get ready and stay ready to fight for it. As someone has said: "Real peace will be established on that day when the first international military force moves against some social outlaw who has dared to violate international law."

The money cost of the international policing of the world for fifty years would be no more than the United States is spending on World War II, to say nothing of the saving in human life.

If the majority of the civilized peoples really want to abolish war, why don't they do it? The answer is that it is not so simple as that. It might be helpful if we paused long enough to ask the question—what is war? If we look upon war as a nonlegalized outbreak of human hostility, as an expression of pent-up cumulative emotions of hate and revenge, then war will never be wholly abolished any more than civilized communities have been able wholly to do away with individual crime.

But civilized communities have very definitely *outlawed* crime, and by means of laws, courts, and a more or less efficient police force, they are able to minimize it—gradually to reduce it.

But there is another way of looking at war—at the sociology and psychology of strife between nations. When we study murder, we immediately discover that there are two views of the taking of human life. We very quickly differentiate between the criminal who kills a man for robbery and the sheriff who later executes this condemned murderer in obedience to a judgment of the criminal court. It is true that both the robber and the sheriff are equally guilty, from the biologic standpoint, of taking a human life, but there is a great difference in their guilt from the social and moral standpoints.

And so we must, perforce, recognize two kinds of wars. First, there are the criminal aggressions, wars that are wholly predatory and unjustified. Second, there are wars which are just and legal, which represent the defense of a well-ordered and law-abiding nation against such criminal aggressors. Again it is conceivable that a group of nations or a world league of nations might engage in war for purely *peace purposes*, with the sole object of preventing the waging of illegal and predatory wars by criminal or aggressor nations.

THE MECHANISM OF PEACE

When work is begun on plans for peace institutions, every effort should be made to keep them so simple that everyone will understand them. Complex schemes must be avoided.

There must be complete understanding by the people who comprise the population of every nation. Russians do not think in exactly the same manner as Americans. This has been demonstrated time and again during the course of the war, yet we have gotten on very well. The people of the South American republics do not think as do the Chinese, and so on down the entire list.

There should be no haste. Wars take a long time. While we may plan for peace during war, we can patiently wait upon the execution of such plans. Time is on our side. After a great and terrible war, the most heartless warmongers could not induce the people of any nation of consequence to go to war again inside of ten years, or perhaps fifteen. We have much time before us. Let there be no "Yankee Imperialism," or British and Russian imperialism either, at the peace table. Let every delegation be heard. Then we can be sure that we are in a position to understand and respect the institutions and ideology of every state and shall be able to help our plans take root in the very soil of their lands.

A program worked out in this manner is not likely to be so drawn up that it will result in meddling with the purely domestic affairs of any nation. And it must not! Local and national ties are too deeply rooted in men's hearts to be lightly changed or disregarded. They will have to be taken into consideration in all our thinking and planning for peace.

National traditions, languages, and culture must be preserved. Only such institutions and habits are to be altered as lead more toward war than peace. Imperialism, absolute sovereignty, and all forms of national hatred must go.

International machinery must be founded upon and rise above these sound national institutions. Stronger organs of world government will grow as rapidly as men and nations see the benefits to be gained from them.

The world organization when it comes should have sovereignty in the field of international relations. Nations should join the organization voluntarily, but a "committee of the whole" should have power to pass on the delegates from all new member nations. The committee's decision should not be purely an arbitrary one, and should never be based on prejudice. Its prime purpose should be to determine whether or not the delegates are true representatives of their states, and that they have not obtained their appointment by treachery or force.

A world organization to function in the interest of peace must be endowed with all the attributes of good government: a legislative, an executive, and a judicial branch; a constitution and bill of rights; independent police and taxing power, and symbols of authority, allegiance, and citizenship. Moreover, it must be democratically organized, guaranteeing fair treatment to both large and small nations.

SUMMARY

The economic and political chaos resulting from the present global war makes it possible for the United Nations to make a fresh start—to substitute mechanisms of peace for those of war.

As this war ends, there can be but one attitude: "This must never happen again." All nations must learn to be good neighbors.

While democracy slumbered, the dictators attacked. But a reborn democratic spirit will presently extend to all nations.

While the war yet rages is the time to prepare for lasting peace. Every Yankee invader should be a crusader for permanent peace. And the world is ripe for just such a crusade.

A United Nations war debt of five hundred billion dollars, together with the scorched earth and our devastated cities, cries long and loud for peace—permanent peace.

The United Nations—especially Great Britain, the United States, Russia, and China—offer us the greatest hope for the immediate achievement of permanent peace.

In time of war let us prepare for peace—a just, fair, and workable peace—a permanent peace.

The paranoid and criminal leaders of the aggressor nations should be brought to trial before international courts. Those adjudged guilty must be properly punished.

Permanent peace involves economic, political, and geographic concessions by all nations. Higher standards of living are indispensable.

Gradually national armament will be reduced as the international police force assumes jurisdiction over world-wide peace enforcement. National war budgets will be enormously reduced by the functioning of the international police force.

There are two kinds of war—legal and illegal. Preparedness to wage a *legal* war will doom the illegal wars of aggression.

The settlement of international problems by war must give way to settlement by negotiation and arbitration—juridicial techniques.

But what this old world needs most of all is a genuine spiritual revival—that would indeed give life to any plan for permanent peace.

Our reason for postponing the conference on permanent peace is that those who wage war are not always best suited to planning for lasting peace.

Real peace will be established on that day when the first international military force moves against some social outlaw who has dared to violate international law.

And no plan for permanent peace is going to work unless proper machinery is provided wherewith it may function effectively.

While we plan for peace during the war, we can patiently await the full execution of such plans.

Time is required to recover from our war psychology.

We can build a practical international mechanism of permanent peace without doing any violence to racial ties or national loyalties.

Only those practices will be altered which are war breeders. Imperialism, absolute sovereignty, and all forms of national hatred must go.

Our peace structure must be erected on the foundation of the best that is to be found in all nations.

The world government will exercise sovereignty in the field of international relations. It will embrace executive, legislative, judicial, and law-enforcement agencies. It will have a constitution and be democratically organized.

•

CHAPTER 7

MANKIND GOVERNMENT

WE COME now to consideration in more detail of institutions in the past that have made for peace and those that now appear to be shaping up for the future. We shall endeavor to discover, if we can, why former plans have, in part at least, failed. We shall want to know, if know we can, what chances there are for the future.

After the first World War the League of Nations was formed. Under its banner many nations united, hopeful of obtaining world peace. This League had a long, elaborate plan, but the only manner in which it could enforce its decisions was by applying sanctions. That is, if a member nation committed an unwarranted act of aggression, other nations could refuse to supply her with food, arms and other munitions of war, or perhaps to trade with her at all.

When Italy marched into Ethiopia on her way to world conquest, severe sanctions were applied, but this merely angered the Italian dictator and made him more determined than ever to establish his New Roman Empire.

Had the League of Nations been possessed at this critical moment of a well-armed force of fifty thousand men, and had it been possessed of the unity and

courage required to place these men in the path of Mussolini's marching legions, doubtless the "New Roman Empire" would not have come into being. That same force could perhaps have stopped Hitler's first tentative move for greater power. The League, using only sanctions, failed.

Organization of the League of Nations was not all in vain. In some respects it pointed the way. What we now propose is that after the present war is won, an organization of all peace-loving nations shall be formed. These nations will unite in a solemn covenant to insure lasting peace, whatever the cost. Furthermore, we propose that each nation shall contribute its quota of men to an armed force strong enough to enforce peace all over the world.

WHY THE LEAGUE FAILED

Many shadows hung over the League of Nations from the start. At the end of the present war we must try to get out from beneath any such shadows. One of these was the fact that although a League of Nations in various forms had been conceived by the leaders of many nations—the United States, Britain, France, and even Germany—until the conference that brought it into being was called together, no common agreement had been reached. Delegates came to the conference with all manner of ideas, and some with private grievances. "The French proposed an international police, the Ital-

ians an international legislature and an economic commission to supervise the supply of food and raw materials. The United States and Great Britain joined in opposition to these ideas. Some delegates urged compulsory arbitration, others would have none of it. Wilson wanted the Germans admitted at once, the French refused. The Japanese, rankling over the exclusion of their nationals from immigration to the United States and British Dominions, pressed for a declaration of racial equality and were defeated by Anglo-American resistance." (*Post-War Worlds*, P. E. Corbett, page 13.)

It is little wonder that a covenant entered upon under such conditions was imperfect. To include everything that was wanted by some and that could be agreed upon by all made the covenant too long, and yet left out much that should have been included.

The League was born amid the haste and confusion of the Peace Conference. Everyone was in a hurry. War was over: Hurry! Throw away your rifle! Grab a plow handle! Get your family together! Let's settle down, get back to business, forget the war! This was the spirit of the times. Who could think clearly and with unbiased judgment at such a time? No one! And no one did. Here we find reason enough for our leaving a breathing spell between the day on which the war ends and the one on which we enter upon the greatest task man has ever undertaken—establishing permanent peace.

At President Wilson's insistence, the Covenant of the League of Nations was tied up with the peace treaties. Since the settlement was viewed by many as unjust, the League was certain to be looked upon by many with suspicion.

Yet in spite of all this—the League got on well enough for a considerable time. It helped settle boundary disputes between Finland and Sweden, and another between Greece and Bulgaria. It assisted in settling many minor boundary quarrels in the Balkans and helped prevent hostilities between Poland and her neighbors. It kept a watchful eye on the mandated islands, and arranged for loans to Austria and Hungary when they were in financial straits.

Besides all this, the League went in for social reforms. It broke up international "dope" rings, checked the white-slave trade, and assisted in labor reforms. But this was all small stuff, accomplished during the years of plenty that followed the war. Worse was to come. And how was the League to meet these crises?

When two Italians working on the boundary between Albania and Greece were murdered, Italy demanded unreasonable amends. Greece agreed to submit the matter to arbitration by the League, and Italy responded by bombarding the city of Corfu, killing fifteen citizens, and then occupied the town with a military force.

Italy was not penalized for this breach of peace, and in the end, the entire case was settled in her favor. In this, the League showed the weakness of its hand. The Covenant gave the League the privilege of advising as to the desirability of member nations sending armed forces to stop an aggressor, but had no force at hand to do the job. In such a situation the League was helpless.

In 1935 the League was given an opportunity to retrieve lost ground. On the flimsy pretense of a dispute over boundaries, Italy launched an attack on Ethiopia. The Assembly of the League condemned this as an act of aggression. Fifty-one nations joined in applying sanctions, but unfortunately, the nations that were in the best position to make the sanctions effective—France and Great Britain—were reluctant to participate. In her fear of Germany, France had made a deal with Mussolini whereby France agreed to wink at his exaggerated claims against Haile Selassie provided he would exert his influence to keep Hitler in hand. So France was lax in applying sanctions.

Mussolini shook his armed fist at Great Britain. British statesmen were unwilling to be drawn into a fight at that time. Canada joined in, refusing to apply sanctions on shipments of oil, and so, with very little interference, Mussolini got his New Roman Empire, and as a force for preventing war, the League ceased to count.

The truth is that the League was badly launched. With one large power—the United States—never in the organization, and two others—Germany and Russia—now in and now out of the League, it had little chance of success.

At present, as someone has said, "the league is in a state of suspended animation." After this war ends, shall we pull the League down from the clouds? This seems hardly worth the effort. A new assembly of nations with a simpler pact, administered by a real organization and backed by force of arms, will give us far greater assurance that the job of keeping peace among the nations will be done.

A PROPOSED ENGLISH-SPEAKING UNION

It has been proposed that all English-speaking states be joined into an Anglo-American Federal Union. This would include the United States, Great Britain, Eire, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

This proposed union would mean a central government with sufficient power to control military and international affairs. Other democratic states would be invited to join, but for the time being at least the union would be comprised of the Anglo-American nations.

There is much to be said for such a union. Certainly the English-speaking nations have a great deal more in common than have any other group of na-

tions that could be brought together. They are united by language, religion, history, culture, political institutions, and a common interest in international law and order. Together they control the world's sea lanes, which are so important to the preservation of the peace. And they are also likely to control most of the world's air lanes following the war. All these common interests provide a very substantial basis for the organization of the coming peace.

A union of the English-speaking countries would perpetuate the combination of military and naval strength that is proving so invincible in war. Such a preponderance of power under one control could go a long way toward preserving peace and preventing war, especially if it were always employed in the interest of international justice.

However, the plan has many serious drawbacks which have to be considered. In the first place, while it is true that this group of nations have many things in common, they also have many important differences which tend to offset all the advantages. Great Britain is a monarchy, whereas the United States has no place in its traditions for kings and hereditary nobility. Moreover, there are psychological differences which stand in the way of the complete merging of interests that would be necessary to hold the nations together in years of peace.

A serious handicap also exists in the tremendous distances that separate the various members of this

group. Although modern means of travel and communication go a long way toward overcoming this handicap, the fact still is and will long remain that nations so widely scattered have great difficulty in acting as a political unit. The problems of government alone would raise tremendous difficulties, as the peacetime efforts at a centralized government of the British Commonwealth of Nations amply prove.

Related to this objection is the fact that a union of the widely scattered English-speaking nations would ignore the paramount importance of geographical and economic regions. From a regional point of view Great Britain has more in common with the nations of Europe than with the United States. A similar statement might be made about all the other nations with the exception of the United States and Canada. A union of the Anglo-American countries would cut across regional lines and to a very considerable degree contradict the facts of geography. It may be seriously doubted whether any organization which did that would have much chance of permanent success.

But the most serious objection of all is that as a step toward lasting peace such a union would almost certainly defeat its purpose. The existence of so powerful a combination of states, no matter how pacific its purpose, would prove a constant source of anxiety and distrust to other large nations, such as Russia, China, Germany, and the countries of

Latin America. Sooner or later these other nations would be drawn together in a rival combination designed to offset the power of the first combination. There would thus be created anew all the conditions that make for war. In such a conflict our side would be at a tremendous disadvantage because of our scattered situation.

Everything considered therefore, the plan to bring the English-speaking countries into a federal union can hardly be regarded as a serious proposal for world peace. It might indeed avert war for a considerable number of years, but only until the other nations of the world accumulated sufficient occasions for jealousy and resentment and succeeded in organizing a rival combination powerful enough to challenge our united existence.

THE FUTURE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

In a previous chapter we have briefly discussed the advisability of continuing the organization known as the United Nations as an organ of peace after the war.

At present the United Nations are held together by an iron band, the necessity of winning the war. The instant peace is declared, that band may fall apart. We should then have no organization and perhaps no inclination on the part of these nations to stick together. This would mean that a fresh start would have to be made.

During the war we should most certainly do all in our power to pave the way for permanent peace, and the powerful combination of the United Nations can do much in this direction. While this close bond continues, questions regarding boundaries after the war should, as far as possible, be settled. We should enter into agreement with other nations regarding our right to the use of air bases all over the world. Some agreement might be reached regarding the use of sea lanes when the war is over. After the war we shall have from twenty to forty million tons of merchant shipping available. Let us make full use of it. What will Great Britain think of this? Well, let her tell us what she is going to think and let us get the whole business settled while the present strong bond exists.

As for swinging a wartime United Nations directly into a peacetime United Nations, only time can tell whether or not this is to be our best move toward lasting peace. Above all, let us make sure of that "cooling off" spell that will allow the inflated bubble of pride over victory to shrink and permit all the natural relations of nation to nation to drop back into their proper places before we decide whether the United Nations shall go forward to greater heights or shall receive an honorable discharge and a cross of great honor for a task well done.

That there is a definite movement toward unity amongst nations, no one can doubt. The Atlantic

Charter, the Pan American Union, the Moscow Declaration, and the Teheran Agreement all point toward unity, and to a greater or less degree, are aimed at the years after the war as well as the present hour.

The Atlantic Charter has been criticized because it seems too broad in outlook, and offers few suggestions as to how all these aims are to be attained. But that is as it should be. First we must have aims. If they are at all worth while, means for reaching these ideals will present themselves as time goes on.

The Atlantic Charter came at a time when things were going badly for the United Nations, when our enemies were accusing us of being unrealistic. We needed high aims, and we got them. Perhaps in the future, our blatant realists who believe in the motto "get what you want and get it however you can," will discover that their realism is not half so real as they believe it to be. It is possible to make the mistake of being "penny wise and pound foolish."

REGIONAL ORGANIZATION

The Pan American Union definitely points the way. In this union the nations of the New World have agreed to maintain a common defense against aggressors. No aggression from without has yet been encountered. At present such attack appears remote. Yet this union has aided greatly in our war against the Axis.

During the "cooling off" period following the war it may be possible to expand the activities of the Pan American Union so that they will include mutual aid in settling threats of war inside a state or between neighboring states.

If this is accomplished, we shall have a model regional organization and will be in a position to explore the possibility of establishing similar organizations in other regions. There is nothing very new about this plan. Germany began as a union of small, warring states. To organize a regional union embracing all of Europe or all of Asia would not seem such a tremendous step.

Culbertson has made some valuable suggestions regarding the organization of the nations of the world into regional groups that would correspond in principle to the Pan American Union. There is much food for thought in his proposals.

There is little reason to suppose that these regional governments, once organized, would turn upon one another. It is difficult to imagine all the nations of Europe entering into a war of conquest and subjugation against the New World. It is, of course, easier to imagine interregional conflict between Europe and Asia, but even this seems quite remote.

When our regional governments have been organized and working long enough to guarantee their stability, the task of uniting them into one world

state should be a fairly simple one. It will take time, but the eventual goal is a world order in which all men will be citizens of one government—*Mankind Government*. Only when that end has been reached will wars disappear and peace finally prevail. This is something to be attained by stages, not at a single bound. We must allow the government of mankind to evolve slowly.

ORGANIZATION OF MANKIND GOVERNMENT

Mankind Government must be based upon the principle of popular representation. When the time is ripe, something corresponding to a constitutional convention should take place at which all co-operating nations should be represented. Besides the usual statesmen and legal experts, this convention should include certain of the world's outstanding political scientists, historians, geographers, educators, economists, sociologists, and psychiatrists.

This convention would work out the structure of the new Mankind Government and draft a constitution for it, including a declaration of rights of individuals and nations. This new government should be as democratic in conception and operation as the world situation would permit and should be so designed as to promote the growth of democracy throughout the world.

It would be granted only the powers necessary to enable it to function in the sphere of international

relations, with the primary purpose of preserving peace. All powers not related to that sphere and that end should be reserved to the individual nations, thus guaranteeing their continued existence and domestic sovereignty. Scores of these racial and national groups can enjoy a large measure of self-government, and there is no reason in the world why they should not exercise a limited sovereignty in accordance with President Wilson's idea of self-determination, if they are wholly deprived of three war-breeding, peace-destroying powers:

1. Control over foreign relations.
2. Regulation of tariffs.
3. Military power—mechanized armaments.

In every other respect let all these peoples enjoy full powers of self-government and proper representation in the international legislative, judicial, and executive branches of the regional governments, the forerunners of an ultimate Global Government.

The structure of this world government should consist of a representative assembly, an executive, a judiciary, and a police force. The basis for representation in this assembly can be worked out in a manner fair to all. Larger nations will have more representatives than the smaller ones. This is right. The states of our nation are represented in the House of Representatives according to their population. This has never worked a hardship and will not in the World Assembly.

When the Assembly has been called together, it should elect a chairman. The chairman should in turn select from among the delegates outstanding men to join him in his Council. This list should be given to the Assembly for ratification and suggested changes.

There should be nothing arbitrary about the number of the Council, but when the number and names are decided upon, the members of this Council should have individual duties similar to those of our President's cabinet. In a speech by Harold E. Stassen, then governor of Minnesota, in January, 1943, it was suggested that the Council should consist of seven members, each with his own specific duties to perform.

First member: To establish temporary governments over the Axis nations.

Second member: To administer the international airports and airways of the future.

Third member: To administer the gateways of the seven seas.

Fourth member: To increase trade between the peoples of the world.

Fifth member: To increase the literacy of the people of all member nations.

Sixth member: To establish a world code of justice.

Seventh member: To establish a United Nations Legion—in other words, a world police force.

These are merely suggestions. There are many who might wish to drop some of these ministries as not being vital to the establishment of lasting world peace. Others might wish to add some Council members with added duties.

Every ten years the International Legislature could, by secret and two-thirds majority ballot, elect a Chief Executive, who would thereby become commander in chief of the international police force—the peace army of the Mankind Government. The election of the Chief Executive should be ratified by the action of the International Supreme Court.

Someone has very wisely suggested that the Chief Executive of the Mankind Government should not be called king, emperor, or president, or even chief. He should be looked upon as something like a supreme parent—international father—personification of mankind—father of nations—mankind guide. The fact is, it would be far better to provide some new word in the international language which would serve to designate the international father.

INTERNATIONAL LAW

Certainly no one will dispute the necessity for the establishment of a code of international justice and a court to administer it. We know all too well how hopeless has been the task of enforcing, during the present war, the code which until now has been known as international law. Every provision of this

code has been violated by one Axis nation or another. Prisoners have been starved, bayoneted, beaten, and enslaved; aviators bailing out shot down from the sky; lifeboats riddled by machine-gun fire; hospitals bombed; women and children massacred without cause. It is little wonder that many of us have come to believe that international law no longer exists. But, with a wise council to establish a just international code, with a court appointed perhaps by the supreme courts of the leading nations, and with an armed force to stand behind this code, the world would be well on its way back from stark barbarism.

Our new world government must recognize the rights of human beings both as individuals and as citizens of their various states. A man must be made to feel that he is a citizen not alone of the state of Vermont, or of the United States, but of the Mankind Government. He should have some part in bringing this new government into being, and should become increasingly proud of it.

As Stassen puts it: "This new level of government must emphasize human rights rather than nations' rights. The cornerstone of the United Nations' government must be a deep respect for the fundamental dignity of man, of every race and color and creed." It must be so devised that it will represent and bind individuals as well as nations, and regional groups of nations.

INSTITUTIONS OF MANKIND GOVERNMENT

All this suggests that other institutions should be brought into being. All too often serious misunderstandings arise between nations simply because means of communication are inadequate or are badly handled. Witness the furore that arose when certain news agencies of Great Britain and Russia were given scoops in matters regarding the Cairo and Teheran conferences.

Because of this, Mankind Government should have its own exclusive means of communication. It should maintain three or four powerful radio stations through which all its doings and the discussions of its Supreme Court should be broadcast simultaneously to the world. These messages could be relayed from station to station in code before being broadcast.

For the same reason Mankind Government should have its own postal service and its own planes to carry messages swiftly and without alteration to all parts of the world. In this manner not only can all the doings of the council be dispatched in absolutely accurate language to all the people of all nations, but all the decisions of the lower world courts will be known by all the world in the shortest possible time. The more the doings of Mankind Government are in the news, the surer will be its success, for the people of every nation will be interested in, and proud of, the great government to which they belong.

An international currency would do much to facilitate and speed up trade between nations. Any one who has done import and export business at all realizes what a fund of information he must carry in his head if he is to accept payments in marks, francs, pounds, gourdes, and so on. An international currency, backed perhaps by a World Bank, would help immensely. Such currency would be for use in international trade only and would not be accepted for any other purpose.

And if the world is to prosper, trade must be increased. This will not be done by raising tariffs. Tariffs should be lowered as rapidly as possible. Neither will it be increased by continuing monopolies and international cartels. Certain of our steamship lines have a virtual monopoly on shipping between our country and South America. This condition should be speedily corrected. Before the war Great Britain had a monopoly on trade in rubber and tin. Prices were abnormally high. Now, when she has lost her source of supply, is the right time for a change. The same thing is true regarding the exporting of spices by Holland.

COLONIES AND BACKWARD PEOPLES

It has been suggested that Mankind Government should take over the control of all colonies. At first thought this appears to suggest great injustices to certain empires. But let us look at it for a moment.

Take the Far East as an example. Of course, no one would suggest that Mankind Government should take over Australia. It is a power in its own right. India and the Philippines have been promised the same status after the war is over.

But what of Burma, the Malay Peninsula, French Indo-China, and the Dutch East Indies? A very little study will convince us that something must be done in these regions if we are not to have a racial war on our hands in the next twenty-five years—Asia against the white man's world. And what agency could be better fitted for this task than Mankind Government?

France, Holland, and Great Britain have lost many of their Pacific colonies. If they are to be wrested from the Japs, it is practically certain that three fourths of the fighting will be done by Yank soldiers. It will cost us billions of dollars and thousands of men to rescue these people from the hands of the Japs. And when they have been rescued they are going to turn to their friendly deliverers and say: "What next?"

We shall find that much needs to be done. Schools must be established for all these people. Their standards of living must be improved. They must be given a real start toward self-government and prepared little by little for greater responsibility. They must be given a fair share of the profits made in their lands.

Who shall do all this? Perhaps, while we have legions of soldiers on the ground, we of the United States will start it. Probably the awakened empires will join in, and perhaps also Mankind Government will take a hand in finishing the task. This, we believe, is the sort of thing that must go on all over the world, wherever colonies and subject people are found. All mandated islands, too, should be supervised by Mankind Government.

INTERNATIONAL OVERCONTROL

The Council of Mankind Government should maintain close supervision over the airfields and airways as well as the sea lanes of the world. For where ships and planes go, there goes commerce. Already, back of the scenes, quiet struggles for supremacy in these fields are going forward.

Equitable settlement of all conflicts regarding air travel and shipping must be assured if we are to keep the peace. And indeed, all the foregoing functions of Mankind Government are contributory to our main objective, the banishing of war from our world. When nations deal justly with one another, when backward and subject peoples are given a fair share of the profits from their labor, when children are being educated, and when all men are given an ever-increasing share in the decisions made by their national governments, then there will be an increase in happiness and a decrease in disputes.

The great overall purpose of Mankind Government will always be the prevention of war. In this respect the world may be likened to Isle Royale in Lake Superior. A few years ago it was owned in small tracts by many individuals. These owners were unorganized and so were not prepared to fight fires. A small fire started by lightning broke out. It spread. Soon it threatened the whole forty-mile-long island. Sixteen hundred men had to be sent from the mainland to put the fire out. Even so, a quarter of the island was burned over.

A short time later our government bought all the land and made it a national park. Now a force of about fifteen men, some watching from fire-towers, others ready to race away in fast boats to any point where smoke appears, watch over the island. There are occasional fires, but always they are out in twenty-four hours or less, and little damage is done.

It is much the same with the world. A small war broke out. We did not stop it or insist on arbitration. It spread all over the world, and now it requires fifty million men to stop it.

The Council and legion of fighting men of Mankind Government are like the fifteen fire fighters on Isle Royale as it is today. If trouble threatens in any corner of the world, they must speed there at once. Arbitration may settle the dispute. If this fails, and if a small war starts, all the force of Mankind Government should be thrown in to stop it. In

this case, of course, Mankind Government will for a short time be fighting a war. But it will be waging what might be called a *legal war*, for the good of all mankind.

EARMARKS OF LEGITIMATE GOVERNMENT

The United Nations should guarantee that every nation in the world will be left free to choose its own form of government, provided it is a legitimate government. What are the earmarks, the characteristics, of a legitimate government? I think the Italian historian Ferrero gives the most simple answer to this question. He designates the essentials of a legitimate government as:

1. It must not be too far removed from the social, economic, and cultural status of the people.
2. It must be determined by an honest and universal ballot.
3. It must tolerate some degree of opposition.

This presents the story in a nutshell, and that is what the United Nations should strive to bring about in every country: a government of its own choosing, a statehood adapted to its needs, and one in which opposition is not smothered.

No government will be regarded as being legitimate unless it assures to its people freedom of speech, press, and pulpit, the right of assembly, and protection of the voting franchise—the guarantee of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

OBJECTIONS TO WORLD GOVERNMENT

Some objections to the establishment of a World Government have been raised. It has been said that, while the democratic nations will understand and welcome such a government, nations existing under other forms of government will not understand it, will fear it, and will refuse to join. Well, you cannot very well force nations to join, and suppose they do refuse. We manage to trade with nations other than republics; we enter into all manner of transactions with them; and there is no reason why the International Government should not wisely create such conditions of international relationship as will eventually induce all "hold out" nations to recognize the advantages of joining the majority "line-up."

If they cannot at first be persuaded to come in, then those of us who are for it—and we shall be a strong company—must go on by ourselves, at least for a time. Certainly all of those nations that have been crushed by the Axis tyrants will look to us for guidance and will gladly accept our plan for a new and better world.

There are many who say that even the democracies, and most of all the people of our own nation, are not ready to give up a part of their national sovereignty to an international organization. If this is true, and if our World Government were voted down in an open referendum, then there would be nothing we could do but go on as we are, vainly

hoping we would not be drawn into more wars, but being drawn in just the same. But before this comes to pass, there is much that we as individuals can do. This will be taken up later.

If, then, after we have done our very best to bring a nation into Mankind Government, that nation refuses to join, what shall be done? The answer is: It will have to obey the rules, even though it does not join, because the good of all the world demands it. After all, we have many men in our land who have not taken out citizenship papers, but they must obey the law all the same. All of life must be so organized that the greatest good may be done to the largest number. We must make the entire plan so simple that the plainest people can understand it. Then at long last we must insist that they obey the laws of the World Government, whether they choose to join or not. If we are always charitable, fair and just, we shall not need to pursue this arbitrary course for long.

SUMMARY

If the League of Nations had had fifty thousand men, it could have stopped both Mussolini and Hitler.

Absence of unanimity among the founders doomed the League to failure. Almost every nation had a separate plan.

Italy flouted the League; one nation after the other deserted; today it is moribund.

Co-operation between the United States and Britain is essential to world peace, but an English-speaking alliance is fraught with many dangers.

The United Nations could very properly launch the proposed international plan for permanent peace.

Many of our problems respecting air bases, shipping, and international trade should be threshed out while the war still goes on. And there must be a long "cooling off" period following the war's end.

The whole world longs for peace, and there is no real reason why we cannot have it. The Atlantic Charter promises peace.

The Pan-American Union points the way towards the formation of regional federations preliminary to the later International Government of Mankind.

Mankind Government must be representative, democratic. It will have a constitution and will embrace executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

The Executive Council should have numerous departments devoted to the practical working of the supergovernment.

Every ten years a Chief Executive should be chosen by the legislature or otherwise, and he should be regarded as an international father.

We must have international law and a Supreme Court backed up by police forces adequate to enforce the law effectively.

The new government must emphasize human rights rather than national rights.

Mankind Government will have its own powerful radio stations, postal service, and currency. It will regulate the distribution of raw materials.

The delicate and intricate problems of colonies and backward peoples will fall in the province of Mankind Government.

Schools must be established among retarded nations—much as we introduced education to the Filipinos.

The complex trade relations of the nations will be supervised and facilitated by the Supreme Council of the Mankind Government.

But the one great business of the International Government is to prevent war and to insure permanent peace.

The member nations of this over-all government should have "legitimate" political regimes. They should at least guarantee the opportunity for "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Not for long could any nation forego the advantages of belonging to the Mankind Government. But whether or not they join, they must comply with its laws.

CHAPTER 8

WORLD CITIZENSHIP

NO government can last long without the support of the majority of its citizens. This is as true of Mankind or International Government as it is of national governments. The weakness of France in the present war was due in great part to the fact that the existing government was not strongly supported by its people. French patriotism was at a low ebb.

Mankind Government should not be undertaken until the majority of the people in all participating states are heartily in favor of it. This means that work lies ahead. The people of Russia, Great Britain, China, the United States, and many other nations who favor some form of World Government after the war, run into the millions. Many books have been written in which World Government has at least been suggested as a way to permanent peace. College forums and church groups in every land are discussing it. Much is being said and done, but as yet there are not enough of us. Those heartily in favor of Mankind Government must write and speak for it, organize groups, seek publicity for it in every possible way. We must make it the subject of a mighty crusade.

STANDARDS OF INTERNATIONAL CITIZENSHIP

We must think of ourselves as prospective citizens of this Mankind Government, not with a lack of loyalty to our own nation but with a desire to defend our nation against future wars.

It is a well-known fact that the public opinion of America postponed our entrance into the first World War, and, had not Tokyo given us a stab in the back at Pearl Harbor, public opinion would have postponed our entrance into the present conflict. Public opinion as strong as this can make Mankind Government an assured success. Our job is to see that this public opinion is roused to such a white heat against the war gods that it will throw its entire strength into the establishment of a World Government that will stand the test of time.

The standards of international citizenship must be early established, but this is a matter which should be gradually introduced as a result of continuous education. After twenty-five years it should be so arranged that no person could be an official of the international or regional governments who had not studied to prepare himself for the task in some school of international citizenship.

Every national and regional government must be provided with chairs of international citizenship in connection with their schools, and these chairs must be occupied by teachers designated by the international chief of government.

GEOPOLITICS

How strange will be the contrast between the principles taught in these courses of international citizenship and those being taught today in certain schools of higher learning in the United States! I refer to courses designated as "studies in the science of geopolitics." A strange word that, *geopolitics*. "Geo," the first part of geography, means "earth," but "politics" indicates the study of the relations of nation to nation, with emphasis on the supposed probability of ever-recurring wars.

The word *geopolitics* comes from Germany. So, too, does the so-called science. Some would insist that it is only a pseudo-science. But we are told it is a "pure science," which means that it is concerned with facts and not at all with human values and emotions. How the practice of this science affects your boy crouching in a foxhole on some Pacific island does not interest the exponents of geopolitics in the least, for geopolitics is the study of political planning for war, not for peace.

How human beings are affected by the conclusions of the "geopoliticians" does not interest them at all. They look at certain mass movements of populations as logical and inevitable. As Lin Yutang puts it, "Populations may be transplanted like carrots, and the 'World Island' may be cut up, examined, and redispersed to the advantage of the expanding state, like a melon. Whether a few dozen school

children have to be bombed or a million inhabitants slaughtered in the process is unworthy of concern of such globe-cutters. It is exactly that detachment from human values, the mathematical concept of physical forces determining human events, and that 'naturalistic' view of the human world as a jungle, that gives it its scientific character." (*Between Tears and Laughter*, page 152.)

This teaching, which has spread like wildfire across our nation and can only be excused, if at all, because we are engaged in a global war in which this study may be of help, is exactly the opposite of our theory regarding Mankind Government. Geopolitics starts with the assumption that wars must go on, perhaps for centuries; that cities must be destroyed, governments uprooted and billions murdered in brutal conflicts until some powerful dictator or vast empire shall have all the world at its feet. This is where this so-called "pure science" leads us. We are, according to the geopoliticians, mere automats, worked upon by outside forces that impel us first this way, then that. We can do nothing about wars because we can do nothing about anything. We do not have wills because there is no such thing as a human will. If we have been going in one direction and suddenly decide to go in the opposite one, it is not because we have changed our minds but because certain "motivations" entirely from outside ourselves have thus worked on our brain cells.

One exponent of this school of thought explains the proper attitude of a geopolitician in this manner: "The statesman who conducts foreign policy can concern himself with the value of justice, fairness, and tolerance only to the extent that they contribute to or do not interfere with the power objective. They can be used instrumentally as moral justification for the power quest, but they must be discarded the moment their application brings weakness. The search for power is not made for the achievement of moral values. Moral values are used to facilitate the attainment of power." (*American Strategy in World Politics*, page 18, by Spykman.)

You might think Hitler wrote this or appropriated it from some other German writer. But it happens to come from a book written by an American professor of high standing. We have been aping the German university professors in our acceptance of "pure science" for many years. This geopolitics is the climax and the maximum. If we do not at once begin to crawl out of this foxhole of unemotional intellectualism where human values and human lives count not at all, we shall soon be buried so deep we never can get out.

REASSERTION OF HUMAN DIGNITY

The best thing we can do right now is to reassert the existence of a human will, the enduring value of love, justice, altruism, fair dealing, and the "dig-

nity of man." Then we shall inevitably find ourselves working as never before for a Mankind Government that will bring peace and justice to all mankind.

Two thousand years ago the world was told that it must believe in the brotherhood of man. Ever since that time small groups of sincere believers in this gospel have been making their way to every corner of the world—to frozen wastes, tropical isles, and the hearts of dark continents—that they might pass along the message. Their voices have been all too weak, the distances too great, but everywhere a few have believed.

Now, if a mighty chorus of voices shouts this same message as they carry forward the work of establishing a World Government in the interests of lasting peace, they will go far toward putting an end to this gross variety of realism which, after all, is nothing more or less than ancient, gloomy fatalism in a new suit of clothes.

Liberty, fraternity, equality should be emblazoned on a new banner. We are not equal in wealth or education perhaps, but all are equal in their resolve to live for that which is noble and to die if need be to avoid that which is ignoble, cruel, and base. Never since the world began, has the human race been faced with a greater opportunity to assert with vigor its belief in the dignity and worth-while-ness of man.

We are now living and fighting at one of those decisive moments, moments which have occurred but five or six times in all human history. Against the brutality and pagan ideals and objectives of the dictator nations we are fighting for the preservation of liberty, for freedom, even for the freedom of our present military enemies. Today, the human progress of centuries is in the balance—to be either destroyed or enhanced and advanced for the good of all mankind.

The only way we can have equality among either men or nations is to resort to the *equality of law*. All doctrines of human equality which are not predicated on law are a deception and a delusion.

And now comes the next step. Any law enacted by a legislative body, but which is not backed by adequate enforcement power, is nothing short of a farce, a mere empty gesture.

I think it is a safe conclusion that the concept of equality without law can only eventuate in war. Without international law and international military power to enforce that law, peace will prevail on earth only as long as the weaker nations are willing to remain in subjugation to the stronger governments, and as long as these overcontrolling and stronger nations can among themselves maintain the so-called "balance of power."

We know very little about what goes on in the conquered countries, but we have reason to believe that,

once the war is ended, and once the nations have counted their dead, and people have settled back sadly in their villages, then from Europe there will come such a cry for peace as the world has never known.

UNIVERSAL LONGING FOR PEACE

This demand for peace will be a mighty force. When this vast throng has been shown a sound and trustworthy plan for lasting peace, and when worthy leaders are found to establish it, no warmonger can stand in their way. Without this force Mankind Government might fail. With it there can be nothing but triumph.

Russia, the eternal question mark, appears to be pointing the way. Today the greatest military power on earth, she might be supposed to be planning after the war an invincible military government. Quite to the contrary, she is offering, in part, to decentralize her power, delegating to the fourteen republics of which she is composed military and governmental powers greater than those enjoyed by the forty-eight states of our nation. Those who returned from the Teheran conference testified to the great earnestness of the Russian delegates as they talked of their plans for making their country after the war such a land of peace and plenty as even the new world has never known. In such a program there is no room for vast armament factories and drilling armies.

It is very important that we relate our new Mankind Government directly to the individual citizens of every country, not in opposition to their relationship to their nations and communities, but rather in supplementation thereto. This will call for a more inclusive loyalty that rounds out the whole without sacrificing any of the parts.

The government of mankind must have a *magnificent capitol* located at some point which is truly international in the geographic concept. As someone has suggested, the administration building of the international capital must be the most imposing structure on earth. Its picture must be in every hut and home, in every office and factory, throughout the whole world. In the upper right-hand corner of this picture should appear the international flag; in the upper left-hand corner, the international seal; and just below this picture of the governmental headquarters of mankind should hang a picture of the international executive father. This picture would of course be changed every ten years.

CITIZENSHIP IN MANKIND GOVERNMENT

Now, of course, this relationship (of individuals to world organization) must take concrete form. Not only must there be a well-integrated organization at the center with a definite seat of government at the world capital (a sort of District of Columbia outside the boundaries of any nation), but this organization

must have definite direct lines of contact with every last person, wherever or whoever he may be. In other words, all individuals must become *citizens of the world*, with all that the term citizen implies in the way of common loyalties, rights, and responsibilities.

The broadening of our loyalty to include Mankind Government should not be difficult to achieve. In the past our loyalties have always been divided between community or city, state, and nation. Our town may not be large or important, but it is *our* town. We back up its ball teams, march in its Decoration Day parades, and show in every way that we are proud of it. Our town may be large or small, but our loyalty is there just the same.

Our state too gets its full share of loyalty. On far-off world battlefields we continue to advertise our state. And the fact that our boys by the millions accept the call to arms in defense of their country and march quietly away to die, if need be, is proof enough of their loyalty to the good old U. S. A. To take one step forward and give our loyalty to a world government which we have helped to organize in the interest of lasting peace should be easy, as natural as the loyalty a naturalized citizen bestows upon the land of his adoption.

The heart of the propaganda of all crusades for the government of mankind must consist in the ideals of *global fraternity*, the idea that "God has made of one blood all nations"—human brotherhood.

The more we, the citizens of Mankind Government, have in common, the closer will be our union. A *common language* would certainly form one more bond between us. It may well be that the present movement for "basic English" is a practical approach to this language program, or if other nations protest the use of our tongue, then we might choose Esperanto. More likely, the basic international language will be made up of words chosen from the leading world tongues. Newspapers or magazines could carry lessons in this language. It could be taught in the schools of all member nations, and every moving-picture program could devote the first five minutes to lessons in the new tongue. The official news of all regional governments and the international government of mankind would be published in this international language.

THE SYMBOLS OF MANKIND GOVERNMENT

There must be an *international flag*. Man is basically an emotional animal; human beings are ruled by their hearts and not by their heads. You cannot successfully carry on long-lasting and far-reaching movements among men and women unless their basic appeal is emotional as well as moral and intellectual. The flag of Mankind Government might always be flown at the head of every national emblem in public, but it must never be more than one half the size of the national flag. In a way there is precedent for

such an arrangement as this. This may not be generally known, but it is a fact that each Sunday on shipboard, when religious service is in progress, the flag of the church flies just above Old Glory.

Likewise there should be an *international anthem*, and that anthem might be sung every morning as the flag goes up. The national anthem of each country could be sung in that country as the flag comes down at sunset.

There should be an *international insignia*. This insignia would appear on all documents and publications of the Mankind Government.

There should be an *oath of allegiance* to Mankind Government. The international oath of citizenship would not in any way abrogate or compromise national loyalty. This allegiance oath would pertain only to those matters which national sovereignties had willingly entrusted to the custody and safe-keeping of the international government of mankind.

PRIVILEGES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Our Mankind Government should guarantee to its citizens everywhere freedom and justice—or “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” It should work for the liberation and elevation of individuals everywhere. It should protect the citizens of all nations in their right to travel between nations, on the highways of the world, and to engage in international trade.

But there are no privileges in this world without corresponding responsibilities. If I, as a citizen of this World Government, am free to go where I please in this world and to trade with whom I please, then I am bound to respect your rights to travel and trade as you please. But on us both will rest the responsibility of keeping the laws of this World Government. If these laws say we may not trespass on the grounds of other citizens, if they tell us that we must trade fairly with other members of our World Government, never taking advantage of ignorance or poverty, and always dealing justly, then this is what we must do. And if we fail to obey the laws, we shall be punished. These laws of Mankind Government should be as few as possible, and so simply stated that all may readily understand. Once again, in the light of present ponderous legal literature, we seem to approach Utopia. But Mankind Government should be for all mankind and not especially for lawyers.

Of course, where there are laws there must be courts. These courts should be so located that they are easy of access to all world citizens.

Every means within our power should be employed to further the growth of world solidarity. Before the present war, a considerable program for the exchange of professors and students between different lands was in operation. This should be so increased that at times, if one were set down on the campus

of any great university and did not know where he was, he could not tell from the students he met on that campus what the country was. Why not? The future should witness an ever-increasing interchange of students between the civilized nations of the world.

One tendency must be avoided, that of doing special reverence to the universities of any particular land. There was a time when a man was not considered completely educated unless he held a degree from a German university. From our contact with these men we know that this was folly. Many educated fools have emerged from German universities, and many educated wise men came from the universities of France, Great Britain and the United States. If in the future the universities of any nation give promise of lording it over those of other nations, some of their professors should be traded for those of other lands.

A university might well be established at the world capital, where the world language would be used and where special emphasis would be placed on the laws of Mankind Government. Here too might be set up an international press, from which would be issued world newspapers, world magazines, and certain books, all published in the world language. A world bank and a world mint might be established. Citizens of all lands could own stock in the World Bank. International currency would

be for use in international trade only, and should not be accepted for any other purpose.

Mankind Government might set up an office of copyrights and patents. To this office the citizen might bring his book or invention and at once secure protection against infringements in every land. This, however, could not be put into practice until consent of the governments of all states had been given, or at least that of a two-thirds majority.

All this need not seem so strange. Even today nations of the world have a common culture. The great operas and symphonies of Europe are heard in every land. Find me the country where the Bible and the works of Shakespeare are not known. The homesick American can find American movies at the foot of the Pyramids and in the heart of India, yes, and in all probability he can dance to the tune of American jazz.

FACING OUR PROBLEMS

At the present time the people of our nation seem to be concentrating their thoughts upon home problems. We are being told how soon the assembly lines will be turning out automobiles and farm tractors, how long it will take for us to build a million new homes, and how we are prepared to solve all the economic problems within our borders. This, we are told, will insure for our people and our returning soldiers continued employment and prosperity.

This may all be true, but this prosperity will last much longer if we broaden our outlook. As we look around, we shall discover that beyond the problem of relieving sheer starvation there are gigantic tasks to be undertaken.

We shall find China ready, not for exploitation, but for vast development. At first we shall be obliged to keep our tariff up to avoid competing with China's cheap labor, but just as soon as it is possible, we should help lift the standard of living and wages in China to a point at least approaching our own. China should be helped up, not held down, as our geopolitical friends suggest. The conquered nations of Europe will be looking for this same treatment.

Mankind just must have something to fight. Human beings are the acme of efficiency when they are crusading for some cause which they deem to be all-important and eternally worth while. For those who thus wish to fight we shall provide adequate enemies. Both Europe and the Far East are even now ravaged by disease. Here is an enemy of all mankind. Let us fight it. A man who gives his life endeavoring to isolate the germ that causes some terrible plague may be more of a hero than a soldier who, amid din of battle, leads his comrades to victory. And we also will fight ignorance, inequality, injustice.

Among other things on which the Mankind Government and its component national groups could declare war are the following:

1. Fire—its prevention and the relief of its victims.

2. Floods—their control and the relief of the sufferers.

3. Earthquakes—the study of new methods of building construction and the relief of earthquake sufferers.

4. Famine—its prevention and the feeding of the hungry.

5. Degeneracy—improvement of the human stocks and the lessening of racial degeneracy.

And all of this means that the international government must take over in its entirety the administration of those activities and ministries which are now carried on by the national and international Red Cross organizations.

Great numbers of the earth's population must be moved, not as Hitler has moved them, with whips and guns at their backs, but by voluntary emigration. Vast areas of Africa remain undeveloped. Perhaps some of the hungry hordes of India can be transplanted there.

LENDING A HELPING HAND

One of the great secrets of Russia's success today is the fact that for twenty years she has done her utmost to educate her people. When the war is over, we shall have an oversupply of engineers, mechanics, and mathematicians, for this is a mechanical

war. Let us lend many thousands of these to backward nations, for a man who can figure is well on his way toward success in some field of endeavor.

No one can deny that a high degree of repression has been applied by the empire builders to all the peoples of the Far East, with Japan a possible exception. Like liquid air, masses of humanity will stand a considerable degree of confinement, but there comes a time when, if too much "heat" is put on them, they blow off the lid and tear up everything in sight. It is high time that these overcrowded masses of Asia were given an opportunity to expand in a normal manner and to develop those rich resources that remain untouched within their own lands.

It is well for the people of the United States to remember that if and when the tides of the human race that have been moving westward for generations, turn about face and move eastward, North America will be the first mass of land that they will reach. It may well be that before our century closes, little brown men will dry their nets on the ruins of San Francisco, and plant their mulberry trees and weave silk from cocoons where Chicago once stood. We must have a care lest we reap the wrath once sown by empire builders.

Shall we endeavor to shape the governments of the world toward the popular and democratic form? Well, not too much nor too soon, perhaps. We must not appear to dictate. One thing we can do. If a

nation, large or small, declares itself for democracy, we can do all within our power to help make that government a success. And that is a great deal more than we did for the fledgling German democracy after the first World War.

Man's highest good can be realized only by the common striving toward a goal that will be beneficial to all. Former practices that have led to international rivalry and anarchy must give way to higher ideals of co-operation and unity.

FAREWELL TO WAR

Strong in the minds of many even today is the belief that wars are a necessary evil; that without wars the world would in time become greatly overpopulated; and that in the end mankind could not survive. This belief was beyond doubt born in the days of the Pyramids. It would seem to be one of those half-truths that live like parasitical growths down through the ages.

Let us dedicate the next fifty years to the task of laying this ghost. By promoting safe and sound birth control; by reducing the subnormal elements in the world's population; by discovering new sources of nourishing food; by reclaiming unproductive areas of the earth's surface; by combating disease that saps men's strength; by passing laws that will retire the aged under favorable living conditions, while doing away forever, all over the world, with child labor;

and by promoting peace, generosity, and fair dealing among all peoples—by doing all this—we shall be sure to have proved, or at least have gone a long way toward proving, that for centuries to come wars may remain only a memory.

And when our fifty years have come and gone, a healthier, happier generation will cheerfully take up the torch, prepared to carry it forward for another half century. Then, indeed, the curse of war will be gone forever.

SUMMARY

Mankind Government must have the support of world opinion. The greatest need of today is for more enthusiastic crusaders.

Standards of international citizenship will eventually be established. National and regional governments will provide courses in world citizenship.

World citizenship is the antithesis of the Germanic geopolitics taught in many institutions of higher learning.

Geopolitics is fatalistic—it assumes that wars must go on forever. It is the archenemy of Mankind Government.

The time is ripe to reassert human dignity—to exalt the absolute values of love, justice, altruism, and fair dealing.

If the present epochal struggle is productive of liberty, fraternity, and equality, then our sacrifice

might contribute to the emergence of the long overdue brotherhood of man.

Man can only have equality under law. And law is a farce unless backed up by unchallengeable powers of enforcement.

Before this global war has ended, the thinking people of all nations will clamor for peace—permanent peace.

Mankind Government must have a magnificent capitol. Its picture and its flag must be displayed throughout the world.

Mankind Government's capitol should be located in a "District of Columbia," outside the boundaries of all nations.

World citizenship will in no sense detract from the privileges, obligations, and loyalties of national citizenship.

Global fraternity should be the keynote of our crusade for Mankind Government. There must be a universal language.

Mankind Government must have its symbols—an international flag, an anthem, an insignia, and an oath of allegiance.

World citizenship will have its responsibilities, and its citizens will be guaranteed the opportunity for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

International law must be simplified and enforceable by the International Courts located throughout the world.

Mankind Government will foster international education. The universities of no one nation will be exalted above all others.

The World Government will sponsor a literature in the universal language and will foster a system of international finance.

The World Government will wage war on fire, floods, earthquakes, famine, plagues, and social degeneracy.

Mankind Government will take an interest in *all* mankind regardless of race, culture, religion, or geography.

When we once have Mankind Government and enforceable international law, we can at last say farewell to war.

CHAPTER 9

DESTINY DRAFTS UNCLE SAM

THE question uppermost in the minds of thousands of thinking Americans today regarding the future is, "What is to be our part in all this work of building for a lasting world peace?" There can be but one answer. Our part must be nothing short of tremendous. We have gone all out for the war—men, money, airplanes, guns, tanks, supplies, everything. We shall have to go all out for the peace with everything left to us after the war. We dare not fail. We should attempt to discover in advance, if we can, just what it will mean to go all out for peace.

LINE-UP OF THE NATIONS

Let us see what the line-up of nations is to be before we prepare to get into the fight for postwar peace. There will be great changes in the relative strength of the great powers. Germany must in some manner or other be rendered harmless. We are being told that even now she is preparing for the next war. She is seeking future trade and alliances with the small nations of Europe and South America. She is training thousands of young Nazis in the art of sabotage in order that they may be prepared to so hamper any peaceable democratic government set

up in Germany after the war that it will be unable to operate successfully. This must not be allowed to happen. Japan, too, must be reduced in power until she is no longer a menace to world peace.

China, with her four hundred and fifty millions of people, has been awakened to a national consciousness and has achieved a solidarity heretofore unknown. Her soldiers, among the best in the world once they are properly armed and drilled, will not be disbanded after the war, but will stand ready to maintain the unity of all China and to claim for her her rightful place as the strongest power in Asia.

A recent broadcaster truthfully remarked: "After centuries of ignorant and dull compliance, hundreds of millions of people in Eastern Europe and Asia have opened the books. Old fears no longer frighten them. They are no longer willing to be Eastern slaves for Western profits. They now know that men's welfare throughout the world is interdependent."

Russia, beyond a doubt, will be the greatest land power in the world. However, with her peace record of the past and her plans for the future, she should offer few problems. Will she be prepared to do her full share in the establishment of lasting peace, or will she do as we have too often done, draw back within herself, fortify her borders, and live for Russia alone?

Great Britain's place in the world will present startling changes. She will doubtless still hold a

dominant position in western Europe. There is some indication that she may join in a confederation of the Scandinavian countries, and perhaps with Holland, Belgium, and Denmark. Her future relation to France is still not clear. In Eastern Europe she is certain to be overshadowed by Russia. On the sea and in the air, shuffle the cards as she may, she will find herself definitely second-class as compared with the United States. Our fighting power and our carrying strength will be immense.

PREPONDERANT AMERICA

Whereas in the past we looked to Great Britain to help us protect our eastern seaboard from attack, it may well be that in the future Great Britain will look to us for protection and support. In truth, only a short time ago she did depend upon us to retrieve the Gilbert Islands for her, and is now hoping that our sea power will contribute greatly to the recapture of the rich Malay Peninsula and Burma as well. Her dependence upon us may be a strong factor in shaping history.

But our strength is not all on the sea. No other nation in the world could have produced the number of tanks, trucks, airplanes, and guns that we have rolled off our assembly lines in the last two years. Those assembly lines are still moving, and will be for years to come. If the devastated European countries are to be given a fresh start, and if the Orient

is to rise like a giant from his sleep, they will need friends. It is to America they will look first and often, for we have the power.

We are fortunate in our location. We are close to both Europe and Asia, yet not too close. We are at the center of the air lanes that run from continent to continent and all around the world. Situated in the heart of a continent, with friendly neighbors on both north and south, we are reasonably safe from attack and so may feel free to dispatch our fighting ships to any spot where they are most needed.

Probably the surest proof that ours is the power and the duty to lead in this great crusade against war is the fact that, as Wendell Willkie puts it, we have a "reservoir of good will and friendship" greater than any nation in this world. If this is true, it should make us humble, but happy.

Says Madame Chiang Kai-shek: "The hundred and sixty years of traditional friendship between our two great peoples, China and America, which has never been marred by misunderstandings, is unsurpassed in the annals of the world. I can also assure you that China is eager and ready to co-operate with you and other peoples to lay a true and lasting foundation for a sane and progressive world society which would make it impossible for an arrogant or predatory neighbor to plunge future generations into another orgy of blood." (*Mother America*, by Carlos P. Romulo, pages 119-20.)

How did we come by this good will? American schools, hospitals and missions have done much to foster it. All the world admires the work of our engineers. Harbors, factories, irrigation dams, and railways that have been brought into being before their eyes by these engineers caused people in every land to exclaim, "Ah! *There* are men who perform great tasks speedily and well!"

The whole world realizes that we went into the present war to save the world from disaster and to retain our own right to live in peace, and for no other purpose. When peace was made after World War I, we asked neither colonies nor reparation money, and the world believes that we will ask no more when the present war is won. They have no fear of us and they trust us.

WINNING THE FILIPINOS

For the teeming millions of the Far East, one fact stands out above all others. We made a success of the Philippines. We took these island possessions from Spain over the protest of the Filipinos who wished at once to be free. Having fought the Spaniards, they turned and fought us. Even after they gave up the fight they looked upon us with hatred and distrust. But we were determined to make this venture a success for both the natives and ourselves.

We sent over a thousand teachers. They taught English and the theory of government. We doubled

the pay of all natives on the island, gave them better homes, encouraged industry and thrift, improved sanitation, and in general, made the islands a better place in which to live.

We did not play Santa Claus, either. The money made by our nationals on gold mines, trade, and industry more than repaid the money spent by our government. Let us ask a native Filipino to tell us about that. "Americans in the Philippines profited in business, gold mining, export and import of all kinds. Big business was practically all in American hands. All American products entered the Philippines duty-free, and Philippine products were sent to America duty-free. Every American-developed need of the modernized Filipino—from automobiles to chewing gum—entered our country duty-free. Steamship travel, clipper service, American Express, banks, and oil companies were American." (*Mother America*, by Carlos P. Romulo, page 135.)

And how did we get on with the natives? Ask in the foxholes of Bataan where Americans and Filipinos lay side by side in death. The Filipinos joined us in the fight because they had learned to love and trust us as brothers. Every native in the Far East knows that story and looks to us for a solution of postwar problems and the problems of permanent peace. We must not let them down. What folly to pay such a tremendous price to win the war and then spurn the peace!

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF STRENGTH

Yes, today we have the nations of the world with us, but it will be easy to lose that advantage. It is said that Americans talk too much. Justly proud of our country, we sometimes seem to boast. We must not disappoint our millions of friends by promising more than we can deliver. Already there has been much discontent because our lend-lease goods would not reach round the world in a steadily increasing stream. It is said that, when we landed on Italy's soil, the Italians took up their rifles to help us, but that now many are laying them down. One of the reasons for this undoubtedly is our inability to provide food in abundance to all behind our lines. Demands after the war will be tremendous. Let us promise little but do as much as we can.

All that we have said adds up to the certainty that after the war we shall be the strongest nation in the world, and that we shall have the good will of millions of people who will be ready to back us in any action that promises to bring peace and justice to a war-torn world. If any man doubts this, let him listen to Admiral E. S. Land, who predicts that after the war we shall have from twenty to forty million tons of shipping; and to Admiral Nimitz, who recently told us that in our operation against the Marshall Islands we employed the largest fleet ever assembled in any naval engagement in history. Pause

to consider: We are now producing more than a hundred thousand planes a year.

Yes, we shall be a tremendously powerful nation, and there lies the danger. Strong men often use their strength to oppress those weaker than themselves. So too do strong nations. We may be tempted to claim lands we have recaptured from the Japs, and to persuade small nations to join us and so build up an empire the like of which the world has never known.

"That's just what we should do," many a self-styled realist will tell us. "Power," he will insist, "brings peace. Besides," he will add, "how else shall we ever pay our gigantic national debt? Look what we have!" he will exclaim. "Air bases all over the world; half a million planes, with pilots to man them; fifteen thousand cargo ships, and the most powerful fleet on the seas. In Africa, Asia, all over the world we will take over small nations and badly managed colonies. We shall make these colonies a success as we did the Philippines. From each we will take a little in revenue, just as a rich farmer improves run down farms to his ultimate advantage. Power and peace. That's it." But we sincerely believe that wiser counsel will prevail.

"Of course," he will admit, "Caesar, Napoleon, and Hitler failed, but all these were harsh and greedy. America could never be like that." Will the majority of our people agree? We hope not.

For this, we believe, is not the way of peace. And after all, lasting world peace should be our aim.

"Peace?" another may say. "Yes, let us have peace. Melt your tanks, guns, and ships into automobiles, farm tractors, electric refrigerators, and sewing machines. Throw away your rifles. Let's have peace."

Yes, the pacifist and the isolationist will be with us again. Their arguments will be much the same, a slight disagreement on the amount of armament at home will be the only difference. The isolationist will want our shores well fortified, our national air force kept intact, and our air bases constantly improved. As for maintaining our great navy and immense fleet of cargo ships, this he will argue, can only result in great expense and national bankruptcy.

THE MENACE OF ISOLATIONISM

As for our relations with the other nations of the world, our isolationist will expand his chest as he asks us to observe what a magnanimous thing we did when we gave billions of dollars and millions of men to help them win the war. "And what did we get for it?" he will ask. "Only the right to live in peace. Now we have that peace. Let us enjoy it, and let the rest of the world go by."

That is about what we did after World War I, and what we got in the end was another war far more terrible than the first.

The isolationists will have many followers. The country will be war-weary. Those who get their sons back will be tempted to say, "No more of this global struggle, son. Now you are free to remain in America and live your life as we have lived ours before you, in peace and plenty."

Recalling the vast prosperity that followed World War I, millions will loosen their belts, take a quick glance about them, and plunge into what they hope will be the "greatest ten years of prosperity the United States has ever known." If you suggest that we still owe a debt to the people of all the world, they will think only of the millions more that must be spent to make the world free from future wars, and will refuse to consider any world program proposed.

The backward drag will be terrific, but if our vast sea and air armadas are not to rust into useless scrap, and if we are not to lose our world-wide reservoir of good will, we must choose a sterner, but in the end, a safer course.

OUR RENDEZVOUS WITH DESTINY

Several years ago President Roosevelt said: "America has a rendezvous with destiny." That moment of destiny appears to be fast approaching. Shall we rise to this momentous occasion, or shall we go silently along the old pathway of "business as usual," and let it pass. We have faith to believe that

the American people will accept the challenge of the vast multitude and offer to lead in the great crusade for universal and lasting peace.

If we do this, and if we are successful in that great undertaking, we shall escape both the fool's paradise of inflation and the cellar room among the rats of depression that otherwise is sure to be our lot. And we shall, beyond a shadow of a doubt, establish ourselves firmly in the position of the world's greatest and most honest trader, and shall fully merit the trust that the world's millions have so generously bestowed upon us.

Before we accept leadership in this great undertaking, we must seriously ask ourselves, what are our qualifications? We are forced to admit that we have more than once avoided an opportunity to learn from experience. After the first World War we were urged by certain European nations to take a part in world affairs. We politely declined. Perhaps we did not wish to be mixed up in the doubtful game of power politics, but most of all we felt quite self-sufficient and preferred to be let alone. It was only after France had fallen and it looked very much as though the democracies would lose the present war that we became interested in a real way in our neighbors in that hemisphere, and then only in the interest of common defense.

Yes, we do lack experience in world affairs. However, this is not all loss, for while we have not accu-

culated useful experience, neither have we accumulated many long-standing enmities and resentments among other peoples of the world. Failures in great tasks attempted and attempts at usurping power leave their scars. On our record are no black marks that time has not erased. There are, instead, many bright spots that shine forth from our past history.

From the start down to the present time we have stood before the world as the champion of justice and freedom. As a people we have never failed to sympathize with the victims of tyranny and oppression. All through her many hard years of struggle toward a constitutional form of government, we stood at the side of our sister republic, France. Time and again when Spain's colonies in South America were struggling for their freedom, we went to their aid. Our Good Neighbor policy of recent years has gone far toward assuring our southern neighbors that our friendly interest in them reaches deeper than trade measured in dollars. So we may begin this fresh undertaking with a well-established reputation for liberalism and fair play in our dealings with other nations.

But just what are our credentials for this unsought leadership which is about to be thrust upon us?

1. We have the power.
2. We have the experience. We know how.
3. We have *prestige*.

4. America is prepared:

a. *Economically*. Trade and industry.

b. *Technically*. Scientists, technicians, engineers, teachers, doctors, builders, artisans, and so on.

c. *Social service*. We are willing to become Good Samaritans.

5. For 200 years Europe sent the cream of her people to us. Now we must pay dividends. Send some back to save her.

6. We are about to show the world that it is "more blessed to give than to receive."

7. Maybe the time has really come to give the Golden Rule an honest trial in international politics.

EVANGELISTS OF DEMOCRACY

The future world order for which we strive must be grounded in democracy and will thrive on the ever-widening growth of democratic institutions. No democracy has excelled our own in efficiency, general success, and long life. The war has been hard on democracies, and for a time it seemed that they must pass from the scene. France fell under the weight of the war, internal division, and German intrigue. Great Britain is still democratic in principle but has been obliged to give up general elections for the duration. We go ahead with our elections and every function of a democratic government in spite of the war. Indeed, the war has done much

to strengthen our solidarity. No nation in history has ever been so united in the work of bringing a single effort to a satisfactory culmination as has the United States in its prosecution of this war. And yet, we have kept our democratic setup. There have been strikes, just as in peacetime, but the moment they really threatened to interfere with the prosecution of the war, they have been dropped. There have been bitter debates in Congress, but always the war has held first place in the nation's mind.

America is the most democratic country in the world. By the very nature of things this must be true, for America is the melting pot of the world. No other form of government could succeed here. And, since the democratic form of government is the one which offers the greatest opportunity to small and backward nations, America is duty bound to lead the way.

One of the most important tasks of Mankind Government will be that of raising the standards of education in colonies and among small nations. When we are told that, with a population of seventy millions, the Dutch East Indies have only three million and a half who can read and write, we realize its importance. No nation is so well equipped as we are for this task of educating the millions. Perhaps our greatest contribution to the Filipinos was the education we gave them. American schoolteachers did far more for the Filipinos than did American soldiers.

It is quite true, as a recent writer has said, that "America feels itself to be humanity in miniature. When in this crucial time the international leadership passes to America, the great reason for hope is that this country has a national experience of uniting racial and cultural diversities—and a national theory, if not a consistent practice, of freedom and equality for all." (*An American Dilemma*, Gunnar Myrdal, Harpers, 1944.)

Ours is a federal government. Mankind Government must also take this form. Just how close this federation of nations can be drawn remains to be answered in the future. Ours is a federation that has stood the test of time. It is true that there came a rift during the Civil War. But this war, it would seem, was necessary to rid us of an evil inherited from other days. And when the struggle was over, it was not long before we were more solidly united than ever. At the present time we are barely conscious of state borders. This would seem to be one more reason why we should succeed as a leader in this new and vastly greater federation of peoples and nations.

It is true that Russia has recently granted new powers to the republics that make up her whole. But these powers are new and untried. It is all in an experimental stage and the other nations would scarcely wish to entrust the lead in a great undertaking to an experimenter.

THE ADMINISTRATION OF MANKIND GOVERNMENT

There will be a vast amount of administrative work to be done in the setup of Mankind Government. Are we qualified for this part of the task? It would seem that we must be for, on the whole, the affairs of our nation have been well handled. For we have left private industry to work out its own problems. But during this war, when units of private industry have proved slow or inefficient, our government has not hesitated to take them over for a time and, as far as has been revealed, has done a fairly good job. During the first World War Uncle Sam took over the railroads and ran them efficiently. It is quite possible that in times of emergency Mankind Government may be obliged to take the extreme measure of entering the domain of a nation and taking over its affairs of state until a stable and peaceable government has been established. We should find ourselves well qualified to take a leading part in such an undertaking.

Of course, we cannot do the whole job alone, nor will the rest of the world allow us to. We must provide leadership but not attempt domination. We shall need the co-operation of all nations, both small and great, for, in the first place, the moment we give evidence of our desire to dominate, we shall be suspected of having imperialistic designs, and that will be fatal. The task is too great for us. We shall need not only the advice of other nations but their mate-

rial aid as well. There are small nations close to Russia that can best be advised and assisted by Russia. The same is true of Great Britain. We probably have more real influence in matters relating to Latin America than either Russia or Great Britain. No small nation can be neglected. From them we shall expect contributions of fighting men for the world police force and, within their means, supplies as well. There should be no taxation without representation. They must be consulted always in matters relating to their corners of the world.

With proper leadership we can count on the co-operation of other nations, but that leadership must be truly great. One of the reasons for the outstanding successes of the United Nations has been the fact that, when a great emergency arose, the top ranking men—Churchill, Stalin, Chiang Kai-shek, and Roosevelt—at the risk of their lives, crossed sea, air, and land to meet in conference. Of course, in peacetime we cannot expect the heads of governments to participate often in the affairs of Mankind Government, but leaders of high standing should always be at the forefront in this vast undertaking.

In the affairs of the League of Nations, small governments always showed great interest. They hoped that here was leadership and protection. They will be just as much interested in Mankind Government and, once they are sure that we can offer them real leadership and protection, will contribute much.

China is sure to join us. Our repeal of the Chinese Exclusion Act and our voluntary relinquishment of extraterritorial privileges have removed the last barrier to her co-operation. When we have delivered her from the Japanese terror, the ties between us will have been vastly strengthened.

Throughout the past 125 years our national interests have come to be more and more intimately connected with those of Great Britain. We have worked side by side in two great wars, each giving all available goods and services without pausing to count the cost.

We cannot very well ignore the fact that there is in our land a large and vociferous minority of Anglophobes, whose desire to defeat Germany and Japan is little stronger than their hope of seeing Great Britain's position as a major power destroyed. Add to these that other minority that is out and out in its sympathies for both Germany and Japan, and we have a real problem. Fortunately, there is a very large majority who, should the matter come to a vote, would favor close Anglo-American friendship, or even an alliance for the purpose of establishing a permanent world peace. The bond of common interest between these English-speaking nations far outweighs any arguments that may be brought forward by the Anglophobes. In this country we have learned to get along with people of many races, and we should learn to work with men of many nations.

ANGLO-AMERICAN CO-OPERATION

Great Britain herself may not be particularly well qualified to undertake leadership in this movement, but, together with her dominions and her still formidable navy, she will make a strong ally and one that will fight hard for world peace. We shall prove ourselves to be woefully inept if we allow the foolish fears and ignorant prejudices of a small minority of our citizens to weaken the bonds of friendship that exist between the two countries. Beyond a doubt one of the most hopeful factors in the world situation today is the unbroken record of friendship between us that stretches over a century and a quarter. This friendship should provide the best nucleus we have for a world organization for lasting peace.

Disagreements that come up between the United States and Britain are like quarrels between members of the same family. They may be sharp and bitter quarrels, but no one can separate us. We shall somehow always get on together. Indeed, for the good of all the world, we must.

Britain's twenty-year alliance with Russia need not be a hindrance in our relations with her. We anticipate no quarrel with Russia. Since after the war our position on the sea and in the air will be better than that of Great Britain, and since much of her revenue comes from trade with far-off lands, she will find it to her advantage to co-operate with

us in every way. The combined air and sea power of the United States and Great Britain will be a mighty source of strength in preserving peace for the world.

THE RUSSIAN ATTITUDE

The voice of Russia will be heard in all future world movements, for she will emerge from this war a very powerful nation. We must not conclude that because in the last twenty years, like our own nation, she has been largely preoccupied with her own affairs, she will go once more into retirement after the war.

She has been engaged in the gigantic task of changing her form of government. That is about completed now, and she will beyond a doubt begin to take a look about her.

If any one doubts this, let him consider Russia's history. It was Russia that furnished the manpower that in the end destroyed Napoleon's dream of empire, and it was Russia's great shadow that hung over the Congress of European Nations in Vienna. It was a Russian czar who founded the Holy Alliance which dominated the affairs of Europe for forty-three years. The Hague Tribunal was largely due to work and planning done by Russia.

By all this we must come to realize that Russia has been both world-minded and peace-minded. She is sure to demand a large place at the peace table

after the war is won, and she will beyond a doubt take as large a place in our plans for a Mankind Government. We have co-operated well with Russia during the war and shall continue to do so after the war is won. She is big, blunt, frank, and honest. So, too, are we. As long as the general outlines of plans for permanent peace meet with her approval, it seems certain that she will gladly follow our lead. Indeed, in many ways she has already shown her willingness to co-operate. When the Comintern became a point of contention, she dissolved it. When we expressed our belief that men everywhere should be allowed to worship God as they chose, she restored the rights of the Orthodox Church. She gladly joined with us in the Moscow Declaration and the Teheran Conference. Russia will continue to stand at our side in peace as in war.

THE ROLE OF THE SMALL NATIONS

There is little question that with Germany and Japan out of the picture, the four great nations—Great Britain, Russia, China and the United States—can dominate the world. But this we must not do. Without the hearty co-operation of the other members of the British Empire—Canada, New Zealand, South Africa, and Australia—and without the help of the smaller nations, we might possibly fail. The population of all these small states adds up to an imposing total. That is not all. Two quarreling

small nations may precipitate a great and terrible war. World War I was set off by just such a quarrel.

In our dealings we must listen much to the small nations as well as to the great, for the problems of each nation differ from those of every other. We must lead, not dominate. We must above all else try to understand them. After the war Americans by the thousands must be found in every land building for a better future. Today our government is educating thousands of young men for tasks in lands far from our own. They are learning new languages and studying the customs, manners, habits, and temperaments of the nations they are to serve. This movement should spread to every university.

Shall we accept the task of leadership when it is offered to us? Can we afford to accept? The answer is, "better than any other nation." When the war is over, it is to be hoped that our nation will be fully intact as it is today, that not a bomb or a shell shall have marred its usefulness and beauty. With our power to produce, in both factory and field, we surpass all other countries. We have much to give, and conversely, if the movement for permanent world peace fails, we have much to lose. In peace as in war let us keep these three words continually coursing through our minds—"No more war! *No more war!*" If we do this we shall sooner or later find ourselves saying, "We must have permanent world peace, whatever the cost."

UNCLE SAM'S FOREIGN POLICY

It begins to look as though Uncle Sam means to accept the challenge of world leadership in behalf of Permanent Peace. Under date of March 21, 1944, Secretary Hull issued the following statement of American Foreign Policy:

Our Fundamental National Interests

In determining our foreign policy we must first see clearly what our true national interests are.

At the present time, the paramount aim of our foreign policy is to defeat our enemies as quickly as possible.

Beyond final victory, our fundamental national interests are the assuring of our national security and the fostering of the economic and social well-being of our people.

International Co-operation

Co-operation between nations in the spirit of good neighbors, founded on the principles of liberty, equality, justice, morality, and law, is the most effective method of safeguarding and promoting the political, the economic, the social, and cultural well-being of our nation and of all nations.

International Organization Backed by Force

Some international agency must be created which can—by force, if necessary—keep the peace among nations in the future.

A system of organized international co-operation for the maintenance of peace must be based upon the willingness of the co-operating nations to use force, if necessary, to keep peace. There must be certainty that adequate and appropriate means are available and will be used for this purpose.

Political Differences

Political differences which present a threat to the peace of the world should be submitted to agencies which would use the remedies of discussion, negotiation, conciliation, and good offices.

International Court of Justice

Disputes of a legal character which present a threat to the peace of the world should be adjudicated by an international court of justice whose decisions would be based upon application of principles of law.

Reduction of Arms

International co-operative action must include eventual adjustment of national armaments in such a manner that the rule of law cannot be successfully challenged, that the burden of armaments may be reduced to a minimum.

Moscow Four-Nation Declaration

Through this declaration, the Soviet Union, Great Britain, the United States, and China have laid the foundation for co-operative effort in the

postwar world toward enabling all peace-loving nations, large and small, to live in peace and security, to preserve the liberties and rights of civilized existence, and to enjoy expanded opportunities and facilities for economic, social, and spiritual progress.

Spheres of Influence and Alliances

As the provisions of the four-nation declaration are carried into effect, there will no longer be need for spheres of influence, for alliances, for balance of power, or any other of the special arrangements through which, in the unhappy past, the nations strove to safeguard their security or to promote their interests.

Surveillance Over Aggressor Nations

In the process of re-establishing international order, the United Nations must exercise surveillance over aggressor nations until such time as the latter demonstrate their willingness and ability to live at peace with other nations. How long such surveillance will need to continue must depend upon the rapidity with which the peoples of Germany, Japan, Italy, and their satellites give convincing proof that they have repudiated and abandoned the monstrous philosophy of superior race and conquest by force and have embraced loyally the basic principles of peaceful processes.

International Trade Barriers

Excessive trade barriers of the many different kinds must be reduced, and practices which impose injuries on others and divert trade from its natural and economic course must be avoided.

International Finance

Equally plain is the need for making national currencies once more freely exchangeable for each other at stable rates of exchange; for a system of financial relations so devised that materials can be produced and ways may be found of moving them where there are markets created by human need; for machinery through which capital may—for the development of the world's resources and for the stabilization of economic activity—move on equitable terms from financially stronger to financially weaker countries.

Atlantic Charter Reciprocal Obligations

We are pledged by the Atlantic Charter to a system which will give every nation, large or small, a greater assurance of stable peace, greater opportunity for the realization of its aspirations to freedom, and greater facilities for material advancement. But that pledge implies an obligation for each nation to demonstrate its capacity for stable and progressive government, to fulfill scrupulously its established duties to other nations, to settle its

international differences and disputes by none but peaceful methods, and to make its full contribution to the maintenance of enduring peace.

Sovereign Equality of Nations

Each sovereign nation, large or small, is in law and under law the equal of every other nation.

The principle of sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, irrespective of size and strength, as partners in a future system of general security will be the foundation stone upon which the future international organization will be constructed.

Form of Government

Each nation should be free to decide for itself the forms and details of its governmental organization—so long as it conducts its affairs in such a way as not to menace the peace and security of other nations.

Nonintervention

All nations, large and small, which respect the rights of others, are entitled to freedom from outside interference in their internal affairs.

Liberty

There is no surer way for men and for nations to show themselves worthy of liberty than to fight for its preservation, in any way that is open to them, against those who would destroy it for all.

Never did a plainer duty to fight against its foes devolve upon all peoples who prize liberty and all who aspire to it.

All peoples who, with "a decent respect to the opinions of mankind," have qualified themselves to assume and to discharge the responsibilities of liberty, are entitled to its enjoyment.

Dependent Peoples

There rests upon the independent nations a responsibility in relation to dependent peoples who aspire to liberty. It should be the duty of nations having political ties with such peoples to help them to develop materially and educationally and to prepare themselves for the duties and responsibilities of self-government and for the attainment of liberty. An excellent example of what can be achieved is afforded in the record of our relationship with the Philippines.

SUMMARY

Uncle Sam has gone all out for war—he must go all out for peace.

Our first postwar job is properly to control Germany and Japan for the next generation. We must also strive to preserve the United Nations.

In the postwar world America will be preponderant. In general, the nations of the world are friendly toward us.

Our experience with the Philippines points the way for dealing with numerous other dependent and backward peoples.

Postwar America will be the strongest single nation in the world. Will we use this tremendous power selfishly or altruistically?

As the war ends, the pacifist and the isolationist will again begin to function. They do not seem to profit from experience.

To a war-weary America, the backward drag of isolationism will be great. Can Uncle Sam maintain his forward look?

"America has a rendezvous with destiny." Will she make good in trade, education, economics, and the establishment of permanent peace?

While Uncle Sam has shunned international power politics in the past, he has likewise avoided the hates and animosities of these interminable international squabbles.

America has always stood as the champion of liberty and justice. We have of late tried to be a good neighbor to South America.

Uncle Sam has the requisites for international leadership—power, prestige, technicians, materials, and the spirit of the Good Samaritan.

Americans must become evangelists of democracy—crusaders for permanent peace. We must remain united in peace as we have been in war.

Mankind Government must raise the standard

of education among the backward peoples and promote the growth of democracy.

In this country we have had experience in uniting and co-ordinating all races and cultures. The United States is a melting pot of nations.

If peaceful methods will not at first maintain universal tranquility, then Mankind Government will not hesitate to use force.

But Uncle Sam is only a leader—we will have the rest of the world to help us in this maintenance of permanent peace.

The international police force will be drawn from all member nations. Every nation must contribute leadership to the Government of Mankind.

Anglo-American co-operation will continue after the war—notwithstanding the Anglophobes. The two navies will act as one.

Russia will emerge from the war the second most powerful nation. Her voice will be very influential at the peace conference.

Uncle Sam has always been on good terms with Russia in the past. The prospects are good for continuing these amicable relations.

But the small nations must have their part in Mankind Government. The quarrel of two little countries can start a world war.

Will Uncle Sam accept the challenge? Will America grasp international leadership—accept the hegemony of permanent peace?

The recent statement of American foreign policy indicates that Uncle Sam intends to accept the challenge of world leadership in the establishment and maintenance of permanent peace.

CHAPTER 10

THE CHALLENGE OF PERMANENT PEACE

ARE the American people ready to accept the role of world leadership to which destiny calls them? There are increasing signs that they are at least aware of the challenge. They—or better, we—now see that we can never return to our comfortable, carefree past. The days of our happy-go-lucky, irresponsible youth are definitely ended. As a nation we have grown up, and slow though many of us have been to accept the fact, we can no longer escape the responsibilities that go with national maturity. We must henceforth play the grown-up part which our age and position as a world power demand of us.

We realize all this, and yet we remain divided and confused concerning the specific things required of us. On the necessity of participation in *some* kind of international organization at least two out of three are fully agreed. (The *Fortune* survey of March, 1944, puts the figure at 68 per cent.) But faced with the necessity of choosing a particular kind of organization, as sooner or later we shall be faced, we are more prone to disagree than

to agree. And on the specific question of the powers to be entrusted to the international organization, there are even fewer prospects of agreement. Nevertheless, it is just such specific problems that must be solved before we can effectively put our full weight on the side of permanent peace.

When this war ends, we shall not be able to return to our former complacent isolation, for we shall be confronted by great and serious tasks. The immediate problems of peace will have to do with feeding the hungry and relieving the distressed throughout all the war-ravaged lands of the world. Later will come the practical and hardheaded development of natural resources and the reconstruction of the shattered social structures of the nations. It will be by earnest co-operation between all peoples in this gigantic task of reconstruction that peace and prosperity will be achieved. Then, and only then, will it be possible to inaugurate a workable plan for lasting peace. But we need not wait until that day arrives to start formulating our plans.

GETTING READY FOR THE JOB

Love of country and fear of defeat may spur us on to victory. But faith and vision are required of us if we are to achieve a worth-while and lasting peace. It will be fatal to wait for the end of hostilities before giving serious thought to the things we must all do to make the peace permanent. Mil-

lions of war-worn, demobilized soldiers and their war-weary home folks are all too likely to throw up their hands and beg for a speedy "return to normalcy." We must have our peace plans well on the way to completion before that time arrives.

To that end we must start right now to study the political and economic mistakes of the blundering peace which preceded the present war. The time is here when we should each begin to think of the part we must play, individually and collectively, in the formulation and maintenance of the peace. We are faced with a greater challenge than any people ever faced before, and we have everything to gain by meeting that challenge fearlessly and intelligently.

We have a great many things to do in the short time remaining before the coming of the peace. First of all, we must start at once to develop a unity of purpose transcending all differences of race, nationality, and party. This includes overcoming our schizoid tendency to wobble between isolation and full involvement in world affairs. It also includes mastering our antipathies toward Great Britain, Russia, and our other allies. Racial and nationalistic prejudices are luxuries in which we can no longer afford to indulge.

We must study how to avoid the partisan mistakes which defeated the last peace. All available evidence supports the belief that a large majority

of Americans were ready to join an international peace organization after the first World War, but were prevented from getting their way by the selfish machinations of a small but willful minority in the senate. This time the people must make their wishes known in unmistakable terms that our politicians will not dare to ignore. As a safeguard to this end, appropriate actions should be started now to revoke the power possessed by a small handful of senators to nullify the democratic will of our whole nation.

We must learn to resist the temptation to relax into soft pacifism and wishful thinking after the war. Both our childish aversion to accepting grown-up responsibilities and our unwillingness to make the sacrifices demanded of us for the sake of peace must be put aside in favor of a firm resolve to live up to the requirements of our world position. Most of all, we must look into our hearts and endeavor to weed out all the dark thoughts, passions, and longings which add together to produce the occasions for war. In the final analysis, wars begin in the minds and hearts of men—not merely evil men, but of men whose avowed purposes may be good even when their methods are wicked. Each of us must seek at all costs to replace evil with good, ignorance with understanding, and violence with reason. Nothing less than that is demanded if we are to prove ourselves worthy of a lasting peace.

When this war ends, millions of Americans will be scattered throughout the world—occupied in promoting the arts of civilization, guaranteeing liberty, and paving the economic and political way for the realization of the brotherhood of man. There will be little unemployment. The world is to be re-organized on a new plan; the age of peace and liberty is dawning, and we are to play the leading role in this new era of economic and spiritual liberation of mankind. But we will never gain these ends by the methods of 1919 or by the old techniques of economics, politics, and foreign relations which have characterized the past forty years. The whole world is due for a global “square deal.”

AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY

We have taken a square look at what life on this planet would be like under Hitler. We discern our fate if isolated in such a totalitarian world. Let us now try to envision another kind of world, one dominated by the spirit of the American way of life. We know how Hitler and his partners intended to enslave the world. When it devolves upon us to help maintain law and order, what kind of policemen are we going to be? How are we going to treat the people of this earth when we and our allies have achieved the military hegemony of all nations?

One thing we must recognize—we are not going to fight this long and bloody war just to restore the

world to what it was before. We will not be so foolish as to repeat the mistakes of the first World War. We do not want Hitler's "new order" nor Tojo's; we must create a new and better world.

Let me make clear what I call the American way of life. Democracy is in some ways a misnomer; ours is a representative form of government. We Americans believe in:

1. Individual freedom—the value that Jesus Christ put on human personality—the sanctity and dignity of personality.

2. Free speech—the right of assembly, whether in a hired hall or on a soapbox in a public park.

3. Free press—even the right of petition and protest.

4. Freedom of worship—separation of Church and State.

5. The federated form of government—forty-eight free and sovereign states but with federal control of foreign relations and all military forces.

6. Representative government. We do not care what forms of government the United Nations have—democracy, theocracy, monarchy, socialism, communism—so long as they provide the opportunity for "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Win or lose, we are going to face a big job. Lose, and we face a return to the Dark Ages; win, and we can enjoy a new order of life and liberty if we wisely plan for the peace well in advance. And

whatever this peace is to be, one thing is certain—America will at first have a large part in underwriting it and in supplying the police power to put it into effect.

We are going to have to pay heavily for this war. We are not going to get reparations, neither are we going to get back much from lend-lease. The only hope of any return is to go through with the peace, and then, if we can contribute to the saving of civilization and extend the sphere of the American way of life, there is a sporting chance we may get some gratifying returns on our investment.

Our adventure in world peace will call forth the very best that resides in American ingenuity, experience, and idealism. It means abandoning forever the idea that we can go on in national seclusion from the rest of the world as a sort of political and economic island, trying to exist as a self-sufficient and egocentric nation.

UNCLE SAM OR UNCLE IVAN

Fortunately, Russia has always been friendly to us. She willingly sold us Alaska. She was grateful to Theodore Roosevelt for the Portsmouth Treaty. She has all the land she wants.

Men sometimes act, do things, because they are lured into action and sometimes because they are driven into it. And there are also times when the hope of profit and the fear of loss so intertwine in

a situation that man is doubly sure to act. The present world crisis confronting our nation appears to follow the latter pattern. Consider the following:

By now it should have become fairly apparent to most thinking Americans that wars of the magnitude of the present conflict (and its predecessor, World War I) are entirely too costly to be permitted. If the American people think clearly, they ought certainly to do whatever is necessary by way of international co-operation to prevent the recurrence of such disasters. Reason and wisdom commend such action; material safety and economic security command it; even idealism concurs. But will these considerations insure that America will act—will accept her destiny as a nation among nations and fulfill her obligations to the family of nations? If these were the only reasons for American acceptance of destiny, the issue would hang in doubt.

But look again at the world situation. Is this all—this *pull* towards destiny? Is there not also a coercive *push* towards destiny? Is the world wholly dependent on America for the achievement of a happier state of human affairs? Can America, with impunity, refuse to accept the challenge of international service and responsibility? Or is it possible that the rest of the world could carry on without America, if necessary? And in this situation, what would likely be the consequences to America should she decline to accept international responsibilities?

There is an alternative to American leadership in world affairs. That alternative is Russia. England and China can move in either direction; and as America chooses, so will they move; and as they move, so is American destiny either bright or dark.

Consider England: By institutions, language, and commercial affiliation, even by tradition, England would probably prefer America as a partner in world affairs. The intertwining of English and American military activities is a tangible earnest of such partnership. But England has not forgotten the American performance after World War I—the clamor for normalcy and the espousal of isolationism. Neither will England forget that awful abyss of national oblivion, on the brink of which she stood during the terrible months following Dunkirk, when her very existence hung by the slender thread of a German tactical miscalculation.

With such memories, England dare not gamble solely on the volume of enlightened wisdom in the United States of America! And accordingly she has underwritten the American attitude by an alliance with Russia. No American repudiation of world responsibilities will leave England in the lurch, but such unwisdom on our part will surely drive England into the arms of Russia. Remember, it was England and Russia who brought down Napoleon over 125 years ago. Together they can dominate Europe today; and with China, the world.

Now consider China: Like England, she seems to favor partnership with America. Chinese-American relationships have been generally cordial; American policy in relation to China, if not always wise, has at least been basically friendly. Many of the leaders of China are Christians, and many have been educated in the United States. But China also fights for life. Like England—but for a longer time—she has stood on the brink and looked into the abyss of national destruction. And what would she do if America withdrew from world affairs? She, too, would turn to Russia.

This, then, is the situation which confronts America: Either the United States accepts the responsibilities of a mature and powerful nation in world affairs and so exercises such responsibilities as to remain attractive as a partner of England, China, and Russia, or else Russia will come to occupy that dominant position in the world left vacant by American withdrawal. And Russia, functioning in close partnership with England and China, could easily wield overwhelming preponderance of power in the affairs of nations.

If Destiny has really drafted Uncle Sam, who is to say that Destiny has not provided for an alternate rendezvous with Uncle Ivan? And should American stupidity drive Destiny to that second rendezvous, what then becomes the inevitable destiny of Uncle Sam?

It really appears that the Pearl Harbor "shock treatment" and the experience that Uncle Sam has passed through during the last two years have served to bring about a tremendous change of attitude regarding international affairs. When the United States Senate passed a resolution committing this country to participation in an international government, we could be sure that isolationism no longer dominates American foreign policy. Nothing has happened in twenty-five years which more clearly indicates that America is growing up, and that the "schizoid trends" of isolationism are passing, than this action on the part of the United States Senate.

OUR RELATIONS WITH CHINA

Our first duty in Asia, aside from defeating Japan, is to help China achieve the hegemony of the Orient. And then comes the gigantic task of assisting in her reconstruction. Ten years from now thousands of American citizens will be operating in China, as well as in India and South America. Billions of dollars of American capital will be invested.

In our fight with Japan the all important thing is the full co-operation of China. We should therefore establish a mutual understanding with China that will be both effective and enduring.

We have thought to effect the peaceful conquest of Asia by culture, religion, and commerce. But now something more is needed—*power*. We must first

destroy the Japanese power state. And we do this not alone for the love of Asia; we also do it to save American liberty, for we just cannot remain free with such barbarous power states in control of both Europe and Asia.

But we cannot transplant the American plan of government, as such, to China or India. The spirit and general idea can be made to work, but it must be reconstituted to fit actual conditions existing in the Orient. Our peace program must be practical. Now is the time for every thoughtful American citizen to begin the study of actual conditions throughout Asia. We should get acquainted with what these people really want and learn how we can best help them attain their ambitions while we introduce them to the American way of life and to our ideals of democracy.

No nation ever had such an opportunity to liberate such a vast host of human beings as now confronts America in the battle of the Pacific, the war to liberate all Asia—through China to set all Asia free for a hundred years, even as, with the co-operation of England and Russia, we vow to set all Europe free for the next century.

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

That Uncle Sam is challenged to assume a position of high and powerful moral leadership in world affairs will become more and more apparent to the

reflective American who will sincerely try to answer the following eight questions:

1. Why was North America not sooner discovered?

2. Why was this country founded by daring adventurers, intrepid explorers, God-fearing men?

3. Why was America peopled by the cream of European Christian souls?

4. Why did we inaugurate a new order of government under which all races and religions live in peace?

5. Why are we "tops" in a machine age?

6. How is it that we are religious but have no established Church?

7. Why do we happen to have the bulk of the world's gold supply?

8. Why have we had the unique experience of educating the Filipinos?

We have science, culture, religion, and language—civilization. We must begin to export all of them.

It is no exaggeration to say that the fate of the entire world rests upon the American people in this crisis. To us more than to any other people belong the opportunity and the responsibility of leading the world along the pathway of peace. Millions of Americans have the courage and the will to accept the challenge of leadership. Millions more are needed to make that leadership effective.

America has shown herself to be "a land of promise" in countless ways. May she now reveal herself as the promise of lasting peace.

SUMMARY

Are the American people ready to accept the role of world leadership to which destiny calls them? Uncle Sam has at last grown up.

The majority of Americans are agreed that mankind must have a government, but we are not in agreement as to the character and extent of that government.

Love of country and fear of defeat may spur us on to victory. But faith and vision are required of us if we are to achieve a worth-while and lasting peace.

We must find out why the peace plans of the past have always failed. We must first achieve unity among ourselves and then extend it to the United Nations.

At the end of the war millions of Americans will be scattered throughout the world. What will be their contribution to permanent peace?

We know what the world would be like under Hitler. What will it prove to be under the United Nations with American hegemony?

The American way of life embraces freedom of the individual along with freedom of speech, press, and worship. It assures "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Lose this war, and we return to the Dark Ages. Win it, and we must shoulder the responsibility of leadership in pacifying the disordered nations and establishing Mankind Government.

Our adventure in world peace will call forth all the very best that resides in American ingenuity, experience, and idealism.

Russia has always been friendly with America. She is world-minded and will go along with the plans for permanent peace.

If America refuses to accept the leadership of world peace, Russia will undoubtedly assume this role. If Uncle Sam does not lead the way, Uncle Ivan will.

Can Uncle Sam afford to decline the opportunity for leadership in the establishment of Mankind Government and the achievement of permanent peace?

England has a twenty-year treaty with Russia as insurance against American desertion of the cause of international peace—as occurred at the end of World War I.

China depends upon America to lead the way to international government and permanent peace. And many other peoples also look to us for this leadership.

Under the leadership of China, America has a mighty contribution to make toward the education and liberation of many backward and underprivileged Asiatic peoples.

We cannot transplant the American form of government to Asia, but we can carry to them something of the American way of life.

There are many things connected with American history and with her social, economic, and political development which endow her with those powers and qualities essential to world leadership.

It appears that the fate of the entire world rests upon the American people in this crisis.

America has shown herself to be "a land of promise" in countless ways. May she now reveal herself as the promise of lasting peace!

AIDE-de-CAMP'S LIBRARY

Accn. No.....

1. Books may be retained for a period not exceeding fifteen days.